

The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XVI

SEPTEMBER, 1950

NUMBER 1

NEW TRAILS AND FAMILIAR LANDMARKS

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF*

Let me make a confession about the title of this address. Several months ago when I had only a faint premonition about what I would say this evening, I suggested to your president the subject, "New Trails and Familiar Landmarks," in hope that it would cover the multitude of sins I might commit on this occasion. As it turns out, the new trails of which I want to speak are certain tendencies in contemporary education which have a vital relation to our work as students and teachers of Speech. I confess that they are not entirely new. Some of them, in fact, are very, very old; but all of them have certain new aspects which are particularly important for us as we journey forward in this educational landscape. The trails cross and criss-cross, they divide, they merge and divide again, and wind over hill and down dale to make a complex and often confusing pattern in the contemporary educational scene. My theme is that the complexity of these trails creates a need for reliable landmarks by which we teachers of Speech and those in related fields may guide our ways; and I am going to be rash enough to suggest one landmark, one great principle or concept, which we may use as a guide.

What are some of these new or partially new and significant trails?

The first one I should like to mention carries the signpost "Language Arts." Those who journey on this trail are trying to bring together four previously diverse lines of educational work — speaking, listening, writing, and reading. I list speaking first because our linguists agree that it is the basic form of language, even though our educational practice does not always reveal the fact. The concept of language arts is a vastly significant and valuable trail in contemporary educational thinking. It has helped to rescue from neglect the study and improvement of listening. It has brought a much

*Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech, University of Washington; President, 1950, Speech Association of America. This address was presented at the Convention dinner, Southern Speech Association, April 7, 1950, Birmingham, Alabama.

PN
4071
\$65
V. 16-18

needed emphasis on the inter-dependence of speaking and writing, reading and listening. In all these tendencies there is a broad idealism regarding the language processes of human life.

Nevertheless, this merging of trails involves certain dangers and confusions. We have been so anxious to correlate instruction in speaking and writing that we have stressed their similarities and overlooked some of their distinctive differences. Speaking and writing are not merely two forms of the same process. They differ in significant ways. First, they employ different media. The one produces symbols appealing entirely to the eye in a rather permanent and unchanging form. The other produces symbols appealing to both ear and eye in terms of sound and movement. Second, they serve partially different social functions. Writing is a permanent means of preserving our accumulated heritage of knowledge and culture; speech is the on-going day to day process in which society lives and moves and has its being. Third, as counterparts of these differences in form and function, there are distinctive differences in neurological pattern within individuals who speak and write. This is neither the time nor the place to attempt detailed description of these neurological patterns even if such a description were possible; but it is perfectly clear to all of us, I believe, that the neurograms involved in co-ordination of eye and hand in relation to the creative thinking processes must be different in many vital respects from the neurograms involved in coordination of eye and ear with respiratory-laryngeal-articulatory activities in relation to creative thinking processes. The current emphasis on relationships between speaking and writing, necessary though it is, has not been balanced by an adequate recognition of the distinctive differences between the two processes.

Moreover, this eagerness to merge or coordinate the study of speaking and writing in our contemporary education tends to reduce speech to verbalism. It is true, of course, that the word "language" is sometimes used in a broad and idealistic meaning to refer to all symbolic or expressive processes. Many discussions of the teaching of language arts are based upon this broad concept, and when it is followed through consistently, the results are correspondingly broad and satisfying. However, the word "language" is more commonly used to refer to a particular system of verbal symbols; and much of our language teaching in the plain brass tacks of everyday classroom procedure is primarily concerned about words and their use,

that is, about vocabulary, grammar, syntax, idiom, and style. This is quite proper and necessary. The study of language, and especially the study of our English language, is a vast and important area of educational work. Nevertheless, the teaching of language arts when guided by the verbalistic concept does not include speech in any adequate sense, because such teaching is based upon the idea that speech is primarily the oral form of words and nothing more. The larger concept of speech as social process, though seen dimly through the trees, is not fully discerned in the forest of language arts. Many a teacher still thinks instruction in speech is primarily or entirely a problem in oral language and loses sight of the larger and deeper meaning that speech is a form, the primary form; of social action. We need a new concept of speech, a pointed and specific landmark, to guide us through the meanderings of this trail called language arts.

The next trail to which I point bears the signpost "Communications." Here again we are often confused by variety of meaning. In the casual, everyday sense, most of us think of communication as a projecting of ideas from speaker to listener; it is an outcome of one individual's self-expression when done in the presence of others. In another of its meanings, the word "communications" refers to the many and varied kinds of instruments we have developed for transmitting the symbols of meaning. More fundamental than either of these two definitions, however, is the idea that communication is "interaction between organisms through symbolic behavior." As John Dewey has said, communication in this sense is the prime basis of all human community. In other words it is a primary, if not *the* primary, social process.

The study of communication represents one of the broad and fundamental lines of educational thinking today. This trail, like the language arts trail, is a merging or an attempted merging of several trails which otherwise would wind their separate and devious courses across the educational landscape. It, therefore, not only leads toward the same fertile upland meadows, but also involves some of the same misdirections that are characteristic of its companion, the language arts trail. In many of our colleges we now have courses in communication or "communications." With a few exceptions they seldom achieve genuine coordination of the various media for communication. One reason may be that teachers adequately train-

ed in all the media are rare creatures indeed. Another reason may be that many of those who discuss communication seem to have missed a true understanding of its nature. They seem not to be aware that its primary and indispensable form, underlying all others, is speech. Just that! Until more of our educational leaders discover this simple and essential fact, we shall continue to wander through this part of the educational forest without clear perception of our goal. We need a familiar landmark, broad enough and lofty enough to guide our way through the complex crossings and re-crossings of these trails.

The third trail I wish to mention here passes beneath the sign-board "semantics." The term is familiar to us. Semantics is the study of meaning. Probably the most significant new direction for this trail is toward the study of general semantics which is the application of the science of meaning to problems of personal adjustment. Semanticists hope to meet these problems of adjustment by bringing words into harmony with facts. They deplore the dualisms of our traditional Aristotelian thinking and with missionary zeal propose semantic orientation as a panacea for most of our ills.

Let us grant freely that the study of semantics is a large and significant movement in the modern world. Its impact and its benefits are tremendous. Nevertheless, I think we ought not to overlook some of its limitations. Verbal reorientation in itself is not likely to lead us out of the forest of confusion through which we struggle. I suggest that the task of bringing words into harmony with facts is not our only and perhaps not even our most basic problem. Symbolic description of the world in which we live is not an end in itself, but is valuable only in so far as it provides a guide for conduct extending from now into the future. Many semanticists are inclined to overlook the importance of the dynamics of persuasion, that is, they are inclined to overlook the basic importance of the process by which we formulate opinions and determine policy. Our friend, Bower Aly of the University of Missouri, pointed out in 1944 the misleading nature of the analogy of the map, which was employed by the patron saint of modern semantics and is in common use among his followers. When we say that the map should correspond to the territory, we are assuming that someone has travelled over it before and has charted a course which we can follow. But in that large and important area of semantic activity which uses symbolic pro-

cesses to determine courses of action, we have not travelled the pathways before, but are continually breaking new trails and exploring new territories.

It is, moreover, a curious inconsistency that Korzybski himself, the arch enemy of Aristotelian dualisms, uttered one of the greatest dualisms of all time — "The word is not the thing." In a sense, of course, that is true. Nevertheless, we should not forget that when an individual knows a "thing," that is when he recognizes or intellectually formulates a fact or an event, a word symbol is usually at the center of the process. This brings the word rather close to being a "thing." George Mead, Suzanne Langer, and other modern thinkers have pointed out this basic truth.

Where, then, can we teachers of speech turn for guidance that will enable us to avoid the pitfalls and stumbling blocks along this trail called semantics. In the modern educational scene we cannot avoid the trail even if we would. We need a landmark, a familiar landmark, broad enough and lofty enough to be a guide to our feet.

Another trail across our contemporary educational landscape bears the signboard "group dynamics." Its goal is a better understanding of personal interactions in group situations, that is, of the adjustive changes that occur among members of a group. The intended outcome is increased ability to analyze and direct these changes toward profitable results. To attain these ends, students of group dynamics undertake to define the roles which individuals play in groups and to discover the methods of building group unity and solving problems by group action. The potential values in these lines of study can hardly be overrated.

Nevertheless, we observe limitations and dangers in them. Some of our friends who are studying group dynamics seem to think they have discovered an entirely new field, when it is in actuality a re-directing and renewing of the study of group discussion which has been under way for a long time. Again, some of the literature on group dynamics gives no adequate recognition to the obvious fact that the symbolic processes of speech are the foundation and core of adjustive changes among members of a group. I fear we may be building a structure while taking its foundation for granted. Finally, the current development of group dynamics seems not to claim and use in any major way the great heritage of logic we have from John Dewey and others who have analyzed the method of problem-solving thought

and applied it to group action. Instead, the emphasis seems to be on group initiative and freedom. Of course groups need freedom to create their goals and find their own way; but many a group would avoid the morass of indirection if its members were instructed to adhere first to the task of locating and defining the difficulty, next to the discovery and analysis of available solutions, then to the comparative evaluation of these solutions, and finally to the adoption of one to be tried out. In the literature on group dynamics I find no adequate recognition of these fundamental patterns of procedure.

On the other hand, some of our friends who have been studying group discussion in its more traditional sense are too much inclined to discount the value of the study of group dynamics. They overlook the importance of understanding adjustive changes between individuals in group situations and the various roles which group members play. The traditional emphasis on strict patterns of procedure and vigorous leadership easily becomes domineering instead of evocative and creative, and may limit the free play of group initiative. Indeed the emphasis on logical procedure and strong leadership may violate the whole spirit of creative discussion by encouraging group members to approach problems in a spirit of advocacy instead of a spirit of cooperative investigation.

What we need in this field is a merging of trails. The two aspects of group processes — on the one hand leadership in orderly patterns of procedure towards clearly defined goals, and on the other hand freedom in constructive use of varied patterns of interaction and adjustive changes among members of a group — are inseparably related and should be studied and developed together. For this we need a landmark broad enough and lofty enough to point the common direction we should follow.

The last trail which I wish to mention bears the name "general education." More properly this is a name for many trails extending in devious ways across the educational landscape. There seems to be no uniform direction for these trails and yet certain common characteristics are evident. Many of us agree that education has lost its way among the trees of specialization and that we need to direct our educational journeys toward those principles which form a common meeting ground for all. To paraphrase the Harvard Report: General education aims to give instruction not so much in the ways and means of doing, as in what needs to be done and to what

ends. There seems to be common agreement, moreover, that a general education should aim primarily at improvement of thinking, of communication, of social orientation, and of citizenship.

Nevertheless, the mingling of trails is devious and the pathways are often dim. Woodcutters in the educational forest have been so busy recently trying to cut down the trees of specialism that they have laid some of them directly across one of the main pathways to the broad plains of social and cultural vision. I am referring now to those who say that speech is no part of general education. The president of an important college in the Eastern part of this country expressed a common and widespread view when he stated his opinion that instruction in speech could hardly be considered an essential part of a general education, and added the question, "Is it not rather one of a number of most desirable, but specialized skills which we hope students may acquire?" Perhaps we ought not to say here that the pathways through the forest are dim and devious, but that some of those who travel them suffer from myopia, an intellectual myopia. The *process by which we live as social beings* a college president calls "specialized" and "hopes" students may acquire it. Five minutes thoughtful observation of the processes of modern society should teach him to avoid such nonsense.

We students and teachers of Speech, however, have no reason to point the finger of scorn at the limited views of others without also pointing a finger at ourselves. We, like many other persons in educational work, have been so busy with our own specialisms that we have often lost the larger view. Some of us are teachers of Public Speaking, or of Oral Interpretation, or of Corrective Speech; some of us have ceased to be teachers of Speech, if indeed we ever had that larger purpose and point of view.

I do not mean to condemn anyone. The educational scene in which we work is complex; the trails leading through it are confused and difficult to follow. Workers within a given field may easily lose their perspective and sense of direction. Those who view any given area of educational work from outside its boundaries, may easily fail to comprehend the windings of its pathways. All of us need a landmark, broad at base, lofty enough at peak, to inspire and guide our educational efforts.

Now that I have emphasized so greatly the need of a landmark, a familiar landmark to guide our efforts, I suppose it is incumbent

upon me to try to point one out. I seem to have brought myself out on the crest of a hill and the edge of a precipice; and if the landmark to which I point proves to be only a mole hill, rather than the lofty and inspiring guide we need, then in simple justice I should be the one to jump over the precipice and let the rest of you turn back into the forest to find your ways as best you can.

I do not mean to be dogmatic nor categorical, but I think there is a landmark that can guide our efforts in Speech education and lead us out to high plains of achievement. To me it seems not only broad and lofty, but also simple and elementary. It is familiar to all of us, but deserving, nevertheless, of constant exploration and re-exploration. The familiar landmark that should guide our efforts in Speech education may be stated thus succinctly: *Speech is a primary and distinctive human process or activity.*

Let us examine some of the implications of this simple theme. Two words in it are crucial, the words "primary" and "distinctive." What is their significance?

That speech is a *primary* activity of human life will need little emphasis. Modern social scientists have made it abundantly clear that speech is the principal medium for social interaction, or as deLaguna put it some years ago, "Speech is the great medium through which human cooperation is brought about." It is also common knowledge that speech, internalized and abbreviated, is the principal medium in which most, if not all, of our thinking processes go on. Because speech is the principle medium for both social interaction and thinking, it must follow that speech is a primary means of individual release and adjustment. It is, in short, our most readily available, most flexible and, therefore, most used means for symbolic formulation and expression. I assume that before this audience and on this occasion these reminders of the primacy of speech need no further development.

The question remains, then, why do we refer to speech as a *distinctive* kind of human behavior? What is distinctive about it? We can easily recognize that speech is not like any other kind of human function. Listen to anyone speaking at any level of performance for two minutes. What you observe is unique in the universe. Yet when we are called upon to say what makes speech unique, or of what its uniqueness consists, the answer is by no means easy. To which of its many phases will you point? I suggest that the uni-

queness lies not in any one aspect but in the wholeness of the pattern of speech behavior.

Lest this seem too vague and general to be useful, let us examine it a little. Traditionally we teachers of speech have referred to its various phases or aspects as "elements." It has been common for us to name these elements as four in number — thought, language, voice, and action. May I suggest here that some revision of this list of elements of speech may help us to see its distinctiveness a little more clearly? There are at least five elements, that is there are at least five kinds of processes going on in every act of speech. Let us call the first of these social attitudes. Within every speaker are certain covert processes that constitute readiness to respond outwardly in characteristic ways in relation to particular kinds of listeners and speaking situations. These attitudes, of course, involve motivational and emotional as well as perceptual and cognitive aspects. The second essential phase in every act of speech is thinking. I mention this hesitantly, because it is not too commonly used a process, at least in its stricter meaning; but in a broader and more general sense, some degree of thinking enters into every act of speech worthy of the name. Certainly perceiving and knowing, drawing inferences from facts, forming judgments and pre-conceiving purposes are essential bases of speaking. The third phase or element of speech is bodily action, not just any bodily action, but patterns of movement that are precisely coordinated in certain more or less standardized ways, verbal, vocal and gestural, for the symbolization of meaning. We understand bodily action to include everything from a gesture of the hand and the expression of the face and eye to the subtle empathy of the speaker's responses. The fourth phase of every act of speech consists of the processes of producing sounds — respiration, phonation, resonance, articulation, and modulation. And finally, the last essential phase of every act of speech is the words — language in its audible and oral form. Here, in accord with the old sea captain's definition of swearing, two processes are primary — knowing the words, and knowing how to put them together.

Now a listing of these elements of speech is not in itself an adequate description of the distinctiveness of the process. In fact such a hurried listing of elements may be dangerous and misleading. The act of speech is not a conglomerate combination of elements or processes. It is true, of course, that many of the names of elements of

speech are also names of other more or less independent areas of action. There are bodily actions and sounds that have no part in speech. Words exist in written or visual form and in other forms too. Quite possibly social attitudes and thoughts may be formulated in media other than gestures and sounds. Nevertheless, though each of these processes has a certain independence of its own, certain aspects or parts of all of them are involved in speaking; and when they occur as phases of speech, they are parts of each other, utterly interdependent and inseparable.

Perhaps this interdependence of the elements of speech may be suggested by reviewing them in reverse order. Let us begin with the spoken words. They are standardized patterns or combinations of certain sounds or phonemes. These sounds of speech, in turn, are the result of, or are produced by, certain localized or special patterns of bodily action centering in what are called the organs of phonation and articulation, although of course the activity of these organs is dependent upon the coordinated participation of the entire body. Bodily movements in turn, are stimulated and controlled by patterns of innervation. These patterns of innervation arise in the central nervous system, and in any complex activity like speech, function under the control of the highest levels, that is under control of the association areas in the cerebral cortex. Now these activities in the cerebrum are the central and distinctive factor in what we ordinarily call thinking. In a complex activity like speech, therefore, the activities of response involved in bodily movement, sound production, and use of words are directly stimulated and controlled by activities in the central nervous system. These higher levels of neural action, however, are dependent upon and are fed by constant processes of perception. In speech a large part of these processes of perception are social in origin — that is, the stimuli are provided by people in the immediate environment; and the continuous processes of social stimulation throughout the life of the individual create in him certain characteristic patterns of readiness to respond. These we call social attitudes and place them first in our list of the elements of speech because they represent a primary aspect of the inner mental life of the individual which largely determines and conditions his processes of knowing and inferring and forming judgments, that is, of his thought processes.

We have gone through this rather laborious review of the ele-

ments of speech in order to emphasize their dependence upon each other. In the act of speech they constitute one pattern of action. It must be perfectly clear, therefore, that the more evident visible and audible phases of speech behavior — that is, the visible bodily movements, the audible sounds and words — constitute the media in which our thought processes, social attitudes, and emotional responses are created and formulated. In other words, the techniques and the content of speech are organic to each other. The content of an act of speech — note that phrase "*of an act of speech*" — has little definite and solid reality except as given tangible formulation in action, sounds, and words. And in like manner the techniques of speech are not merely processes added to thoughts for the sake of revealing them, but are the very core and substance of the medium in which thoughts achieve their reality. Any other concept of the relations between content and technique in speaking, or if you prefer, between content and delivery, seems to me to commit us to a hopeless artificiality in the approach to our subject as students and teachers of speech.

May I illustrate my point by one final comparison? I know little or nothing about chemistry, but I do recall that water, a molecule of water, is composed of two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen. In that molecule of water, however, the hydrogen and the oxygen have lost their separate identities. They cease to be hydrogen and oxygen as such and have been merged in a new unit — the molecule of water. Now this molecule may be broken down and the hydrogen and oxygen released to their own separate and distinctive existence, but then we no longer have water. In like manner, the elements or phases of speech, though they may have their own distinct identities, lose those identities and become parts of each other in the act of speaking. If I seem to belabor this point unduly, I remind you that the concept I am developing here is the foe of atomism; and that atomism in the form of mechanistic drills, narrow concepts, and specialized interests within our field is the greatest enemy of progress in speech education.

Let us return to the main point. I am trying to define or explain the bases on which we recognize speech as a distinctive kind of human behavior. I have been trying to develop the point that the wholeness of the act of speech in terms of the interdependence of its elements is its first distinctive characteristic.

There is, however, another way to define the distinctiveness of the fact of speech. We have been considering the matter from the standpoint of what goes on in the individual who speaks. Let us now define the distinctiveness of the act of speech in terms of interaction between forces in the speaking situation. Here our viewpoint is social rather than individual. We are looking at what happens between man and man. We are looking at the total setting in which an act of speech occurs. What basic elements are common to all speaking situations? They are, briefly, (1) speaker; (2) listener; (3) location — that is, time and place; (4) things meant or potential things meant — that is objects, properties of objects, actions, experiences, ideas, etc.; and (5) a body of commonly understood symbolic material — that is words, gestures, vocal modulations. These are the elements which operate in any speaking situation.

An act of speech, therefore, may be defined as interaction between these forces. Its exact form and pattern as well as its results are influenced by the nature of every factor in the situation, that is, by the capacities and purposes of both speaker and listener, by the kind of location, by the kind and variety of things talked about, and by the adequacy of the symbolic material. The elements of the speaking situation like the elements of the speech act itself are so interdependent that they enhance and emphasize the unique wholeness of speech as a function of human life.

There is, however, a third possible way in which we may define the distinctiveness of speech as a life activity. All of us recognize that the elements of speech and the elements of speaking situations are highly variable. As a result, there are many forms or uses of speech and they are as variable as the situations in which we find ourselves in this social world. We converse, telephone, discuss, address audiences, tell stories, read aloud, impersonate or act, and in fact use a great variety of each of these several forms of speech. Yet only a casual observation of these many types of speaking activity shows that in spite of their differences they are fundamentally alike. All of them involve the same fundamental phases or elements of action within the individual speaker. All of them involve the same general types of interaction among the elements of the speaking situation. All of them are speech in a general and universal sense. It is this fundamental similarity, this basic common denominator, which distinguishes speech as a human process from the wide variety of

other processes or activities which characterize human conduct. Perhaps this concept, also, will help us to understand the distinctiveness of an act of speech.

Now we ought to pause here to ask, frankly, "so what?" What difference does all this talk about the distinctiveness of the act of speech make? Again, I think the answers are simple and fundamental. In this concept of speech as a distinctive and primary kind of human behavior we have a basis for unifying all the various aspects of our work. Under the influence of this philosophy of speech, our rhetoricians will cease to be much concerned about the petty practicalities of personal success whether in salesmanship or in decisions won, and will stress more their historical and philosophical backgrounds and broad social utilities. Under such a philosophy our speech pathologists will be less concerned about the mechanics of vocal and articulatory processes and more concerned about the prevention of speech disorders and the development and reorientation of handicapped individuals. Under such a philosophy our drama teachers will be less blinded by the glare of Hollywood and Broadway and will be concerned not so much about the play as about the cultural growth of the student. That much abused slogan, "the play is the thing," is not only a misinterpretation of the immortal bard but a damnable distortion of sound educational doctrine. We are not trying to "catch the conscience of the king"; we are trying to educate young men and women to be citizens of our democratic way of life. All of us, whether our particular efforts are labelled public speaking, or correction, or drama, ought to be teachers of speech.

In professional education, of course, our various specialisms have their place, and I do not mean to deny the importance of professional education. What I am trying to point out is that in a democracy the main purposes of education are, and ought to be, the cultural and civic growth of the individuals who make up our society. What I am saying to all of you, my colleagues in the study and teaching of speech, is that there is no excuse for shriveling our concept of speech to suit our own particular goals, or for thinking of our areas as separate or separable from each other. We are members one of another and if we do not recognize that basic fact we are very likely to wither away and die under the tree of knowledge.

There is another important answer to that question "so what?" In this concept of speech as a primary and distinctive aspect of human life we have a basis for relating our work to the world of knowl-

edge and to the social and educational viewpoints of our day. With such a philosophy we can face the educational world as a single body of scholars devoted to the study and teaching of a basic aspect of human life and conduct. We can look our comrades in educational work squarely in the eye, and insist that speech is something more than the oral form of language; that it is the primary means of communication and therefore the indispensable warp of our entire social fabric; that semantics is a useful handmaiden for our educational endeavours, but not a panacea for all our ills; that studies in group dynamics are an important extension of the studies in group discussion which we have been carrying on for many years; and that general education without a sound foundation in speech training is an insult to our students because it deprives them of specific development in that medium by which they think and live as social beings.

We travel many trails through the forests and across the plains of education. We must do so because our work is many-sided and its applications to life are rich, broad, and deep. Let no one misunderstand our insistence on the distinctiveness of speech as a life activity. It does not imply an isolation or separation of our endeavors from those of our colleagues in other areas. On the contrary, it requires the closest working together among all of us. Cooperation, let me remind you, implies the equality of men. We shall not submit to that small number of educators who in keeping with their own limited understandings of speech would push us to one side in the educational pattern. We shall face them as equals and demand the fullest of genuine cooperation. There is no place for uniformity among us, but unity of goal and direction are indispensable. My theme is that in this complex and often confusing maze of pathways in the educational world we should keep our eyes fixed upon one great landmark — the simple and elementary concept that speech is a primary and distinctive aspect of human life.

With our gaze fixed steadily upon that landmark, all of us who are engaged in the study and teaching of speech may share something of Browning's faith in Paracelsus—

I go to prove my soul!

I see my way as birds their trackless way.

I shall arrive! What time, what circuit first,

I ask not: but unless God send his hail

Or blinding fireballs, sleet or stifling snow,

In some time, His good time, I shall arrive. . . .

A NORTHERN WHIG AND THE SOUTHERN CAUSE

J. JEFFREY AUER*

In the campaign which put Abraham Lincoln into the White House, Tom Corwin, the colorful "Wagon Boy of Ohio," was one of the most active and effective spokesmen.¹ But when the election was over, it was the probable influence of Corwin upon the new administration that the radical abolitionists of his party feared most. Along with John Bell, Robert Schenck, and Thomas Ewing, they labelled Corwin a "Fossil Whig," and launched a campaign to undermine his standing with Chase and other party leaders.² There were not a few who doubted Lincoln's ability to resist "the old men." Cried one, "Oh for an hour of Old Hickory or Old Zach!"³ In short, the radical Republicans were tortured by the thought that they might have turned out the time-serving Democrats only to let in the equally compromising representatives of Whiggery. And their fears were not groundless.

Before the Chicago convention which nominated Lincoln a future governor of Massachusetts wrote hopefully of his party: "Made up of somewhat diverse antecedent fellowships and associations, we can nevertheless move on harmoniously in solid column."⁴ This was, indeed, a sanguine view of the Republican party. Few coalitions in political history have been built from quite such diversity: anti-slavery Whigs and Free Soil Democrats, die-hard Whigs and disgruntled Democrats, Know Nothings and Unionists, protectionists and homesteaders, and a half dozen other groups. Roughly, how-

*Chairman, Department of Speech, Oberlin College.

¹See James F. Rhodes, *A History Of The United States From The Compromise Of 1850*, 8 vols. (New York, 1892-1914), II, 484.

²See letters to Salmon P. Chase, Nov., Dec., Chase MSS., cited in William E. Baringer, *A House Dividing: Lincoln as President Elect* (Springfield, 1945), 63-64, and in David M. Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis* (New Haven, 1942), 36-39.

³Fitz-Henry Warren to Pike, Dec. 16, 1860, in James S. Pike, *First Blows of the Civil War* (New York, 1870), 526.

⁴A. H. Bullock to Samuel Bowles, Oct. 6, 1859, Banks MSS., in Harry J. Carman and Reinhard H. Luthin, *Lincoln and the Patronage* (New York, 1943), 6.

ever, the party could be divided into two groups. On the one hand were the radicals, fiercely abolitionist, and quite willing to see the party sectionalized. On the other were the moderates, like Tom Corwin, who hoped for adjustment and compromise on the slavery question in order to nationalize the party. Before the Republicans could deal with the "irrepressible conflict" in the nation they had to settle their own differences.

The position of the radicals in this intraparty conflict is familiar. Some insight into the less well known position of the moderates may be offered by a review of the role of Tom Corwin in the campaigns of 1858-59-60, as he spoke of old line Whiggery in the nation's crisis.

I. TOM CORWIN: WHIG

Thomas Corwin was, for over two decades, the favorite Whig son of Ohio, and a national leader of the party who ranked with Webster and Clay. Largely self-educated, the son of middle-class parents who migrated from Kentucky before 1800, Corwin grew up in the Little Miami Valley, a few miles north of Cincinnati. In 1817 he began practicing law in Lebanon, Ohio, and served ten years as a county prosecuting attorney and three terms in the state legislature before he was first sent to Congress in 1830. There, when the Whigs produced only minority reports during the Jacksonian era, he served for a decade, resigning in 1840 to run for governor of Ohio. Defeated for re-election in 1842, he resumed his brilliant and highly rewarding law practice until 1845 when he was sent to the United States Senate, a reward for his vigorous stumping which helped carry Ohio for Henry Clay the year before. In the Senate he crystallized and led the opposition to the Mexican War, fighting both the expansion of territory and the extension of slavery in an effort to compromise the crisis question. He was, however, no out-and-out abolitionist: when his stand against the war, allegedly the child of a "slavocracy conspiracy," won him the support of Sumner, Adams, Wilson, Seward, Greeley, Giddings, and Chase, and an invitation to head their movement on a national ticket,⁵ he turned them down.⁶ He was true to

⁵See Horace Greeley to Giddings [n. d., but after adjournment of the 29th Congress], in Walter Buell, *Joshua R. Giddings: A Sketch* (Cleveland, 1882), 169; Giddings to Charles Sumner, Feb. 11, 1847, in George W. Julian, *Life of Joshua R. Giddings* (Chicago, 1892), 199; Charles Francis Adams to Gid-

the first principle of Whig strategy: oppose all divisive movements.

Corwin was also loyal to the second tenet of Whig strategy: compromise whenever basic disagreements can be resolved in no other way. He reluctantly accepted General Zachary Taylor as a compromise nominee in 1848, and his spirited work for Old Zach in the Ohio canvass, speaking two to three hours a day, was a major factor, by the admission of his opponents, in preventing many antislavery Whigs from bolting the party.⁷ Near the close of his Senate career, while he favored enforcing the Northern viewpoint, "firmly yet temperately," he gave general support to the purposes of Clay's Omnibus Bill.⁸ By the time the vote was taken on the Compromise of 1850 Corwin was Secretary of the Treasury in Fillmore's cabinet, but he urged his chief to approve even the Fugitive Slave Law, not because he liked it, but because "it was for the President to see whether the laws were constitutional, not whether they were good laws."⁹ When he retired from the cabinet in 1853 his party had virtually died of acute indecision, and Corwin felt no further taste for politics. Again he returned to the law, and could not be persuaded to run for Congress in 1854, though he was strongly opposed to the Kansas-Nebraska Act and any attack upon the Missouri Compromise.¹⁰

Throughout his long political career Corwin had built a reputation as one of the most effective stump speakers in the nation. Even that crusty old critic, John Quincy Adams, a former Harvard professor of rhetoric and oratory, ranked Corwin among the leading Whig orators of his day; Rutherford B. Hayes heard him "far ex-

dings, Julian, *Giddings*, 199-200; Sumner to Chase, March 12, 1847, Chase MSS., Library of Congress; Sumner to Cleveland *Daily True Democrat*, Aug. 15, Dec. 25, 1847; Henry Wilson to Boston *Whig*, Aug. 18, 1847.

⁶In his speech at Carthage, Ohio. See *Daily Cincinnati Atlas*, Sept. 27; Columbus *Ohio Statesman*, Sept. 22, 29, 1847.

⁷Cleveland *Herald*, Sept. 6, 1848; Chase to Sumner, Nov. 27, 1848, in "Diary and Correspondence of Salmon P. Chase," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1902*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1903), II, 142-143. See, also, Thomas Ewing to John J. Crittenden, Sept. 24, 1848; Vance to Crittenden, Sept. 21, 1848, Crittenden MSS., Library of Congress.

⁸See Corwin to Judge Hitchcock, Feb. 13, 1850, Corwin MSS., Library of Congress; *Cong. Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Ses., 1003, 1134-1135.

⁹Rhodes, *History*, I, 301; Josiah Morrow, ed., *Life and Speeches of Thomas Corwin* (Cincinnati, 1896), 436.

¹⁰Corwin to Crittenden, March 10, 1854, Crittenden MSS.

celling anything that [Edward] Everett did," and Chauncey Depew remembered him as "probably the most brilliant speaker of the period immediately preceding the Civil War." The president of Cornell University went even further, classing Corwin as "the most famous stump speaker of his time, perhaps of all time."¹¹ In Congress, too, he was among the leading party orators: his powers of sarcasm made him "the terror of all younger members," and the Washington correspondent of one leading paper characterized him as "the ablest, most eloquent and successful speakers in the American Congress."¹² In short, Tom Corwin's considerable influence upon the men and events of his day was through the spoken word.

II. THE REPUBLICAN RECRUIT, 1858

In 1858 the managers of the young Republican party needed just such eloquent champions as Corwin, known for love of the Constitution, conservative, and apparent compromisers. It had been demonstrated in 1856, when the party failed to elect Fremont, that its base needed to be broadened. The Democrats, to be sure, were already showing signs of internal dissension which would kill them as effectively as that same malady had hastened the death of the Whig party a few years before, but in 1856 they still stood as the only truly national party. If the Republicans were to win the next election they could do no less than hope to nationalize their own party; they dared do no less than attempt to draw into their party a large segment of the Northern conservative vote that had always previously gone Whig. For this they needed experienced, old-party campaigners, who could be drafted or driven by despair into the Republican ranks.

Corwin was one of the most notable recruits of 1858. In the election two years before he had personally favored Fillmore, running with the support of the Know Nothings and a remnant of the Whig

¹¹Charles F. Adams, ed., *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, 12 vols. (Philadelphia, 1876), X, 321; Charles R. Williams, ed., *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Burchard Hayes*, 4 vols. (Columbus, 1922), I, 513; Chauncey M. Depew *My Memories of Eighty Years* (New York, 1922), 321; *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White*, 2 vols. (New York, 1905), I, 50.

¹²W. F. G. Chanks, "Tom Corwin of Ohio," *Harpers* 35 (1867), 80; New York *Morning Herald*, in Lebanon *Western Star*, Feb. 28, 1840.

party, believing his old chief "would do the most toward quieting the unnatural and perhaps dangerous agitation of the public mind." But since he recognized that "there is no vestige of the shadow of a hope for the ghost of a chance for Fillmore," he advised his friends in the North to support Fremont.¹³ To the Republicans, damned as radicals in the eyes of many Northern conservatives, the Wagon Boy would be a welcome balance. He was an antislavery man, as his opposition to the annexation of Texas and to the Mexican War had shown, yet not an abolitionist; he was a conservative who fought for the Bank of the United States in the days of Jackson, a believer in a high protective tariff, and a champion of federally-supported internal improvements; he had joined Henry Clay in formulating compromise solutions for the North-South conflict, and among his friends were Southerners like Leslie Combs, Reverdy Johnson, and W. P. Mangum. In Ohio, and perhaps across the nation, Corwin could be a substantial conservative spokesman for the Republican cause, one of the few who might appeal to the old Fillmore Whigs.¹⁴ There was more than a little truth in the jibes of the Democratic editors who accused the Republicans of rummaging the political graveyard for leaders who would nationalize the party.¹⁵

When the Republican managers of Ohio offered to send Corwin back to Congress, apparently in exchange for a speaking tour of the state, not all party members welcomed him. The radicals thought of him as a "Fossil Whig," the abolitionists suspected he would oppose only the extension of slavery, and those who had worked for Fremont in 1856 called him a "Johnny Come Lately." Nevertheless, he was drafted for the nomination by the managers, and won it from the rank-and-file.¹⁶ In August, 1858, the Wagon Boy was running for Congress as a Republican; it had taken him ten years, since he refused the presidential nomination of the antislavery Whigs in 1848, to swing that far in his thinking.

From the tone of the Ohio Democratic press, it was apparent that

¹³Speech reported in *Cleveland Leader*, Oct. 29, and letter to editor, *Columbus, Ohio State Journal*, Nov. 1, 1856.

¹⁴See *Columbus Ohio State Journal*, July 2; *Cincinnati Commercial*, July 7; *Portsmouth Times*, Aug. 4, 1858.

¹⁵*Columbus Ohio Statesman*, Sept. 4, 1858.

¹⁶Letter from W. H. P. Denny, *ibid.*, Aug. 7; see, also, *ibid.*, Aug. 18, 19, 20, 1858.

the memories of Corwin's old magic on the stump were still vivid; he received one of the harshest welcomes given to any opponent in the canvass.¹⁷ The mildest charge was that Corwin could not really endorse Republican doctrine; but in his "comeback speech" at the opening of the campaign he denounced "squatter sovereignty" and argued for the right and obligation of Congress to "pass laws prohibiting slavery in all *territory* where it does not exist." In effect he still urged the views of his famous Whig strategy speech at Carthage in 1847; it was the Wilmot Proviso argument brought up to date: "Do not let the territory become slave . . . and the people will not be apt to apply for admission into the Union with a slave constitution." The present problem, he declared, came from the repeal of the Missouri Compromise: "Nothing but insanity dictated it; nothing but anarchy resulted." Aside from the slavery issue Corwin revived two Whiggish views, urging a cut in government expenses and supporting an increase in the tariff.¹⁸

Even Democrats acknowledged that the Wagon Boy was still a great orator, but contended that "the world has moved rapidly" while he was "out of political harness. He was a "Rip Van Winkle," trying to return with old solutions to new problems; and because he feared losing Whig votes if he went too far toward Republicanism, he had hedged. When he argued that a territory could not legally be kept from statehood even with a slave constitution (asking whether Pennsylvania would be expelled from the Union if she changed her constitution to permit slavery) he was taking Democratic, not Republican, grounds.¹⁹ The Whigs, on the other hand, praised the speech as "eloquent and forceful," and the speaker as "really at heart with the Republicans. . . ."²⁰ They were even happier when, at the district party caucus, Corwin accepted the Philadelphia platform without reservation. He did not fear a dissolution of the Union, he said in an impromptu speech, for the rejection of the Kansas Lecompton Constitution had undoubtedly "convinced the South of the will of the people of the North." Now if the North wanted to settle the

¹⁷*Ibid.*, June 18, July 7, 31; Aug. 10, 18; Sept. 3, 4, 5, 1858.

¹⁸Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Aug. 7; Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Aug. 7, 1858.

¹⁹Cleveland *Leader*, Aug. 10; Columbus, *Ohio Statesman*, Aug. 10, 13, 1858.

²⁰Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Aug. 10; Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Aug. 7, 1858.

sectional differences, added the old Whig compromiser, it should follow a policy of "generous and magnanimous persuasion, and mild conciliatory measures."²¹

"Old Tom is in the field again!" went the campaign song as Corwin canvassed his district and invaded a number of neighboring ones, appealing particularly to the Whigs who had been his personal followers in the campaigns from 1830 to 1848. The crowds were large and enthusiastic, they responded freely to Corwin's humorous sallies, and there was a good deal of excited interchange between speaker and audience.²² While the campaign, on the whole, was uneventful, observed one historian, it was Tom Corwin, on the Republican side, who saved it from dullness. His speech at the state capital showed Corwin still the master of anecdote, irony, and sarcasm: "The Dred Scott decision carried slavery any and everywhere. You might legislate horses, jackasses, or thieves out of Kansas; you might say no man should carry ten thousand rattlesnakes there and turn them loose . . . but you couldn't legislate slavery out." As for threats of disunion: he had seen the Union "dissolved three times in one session of Congress."²³ Corwin's delivery, too, was effective as ever. He had always been noted for his rare gift of pantomime; "half his speeches are in his face," one reporter wrote. In this campaign his hearers commented on "those indescribable looks with which Corwin can at any time throw an audience into convulsions," and declared that he really made two speeches at once, one with his tongue, one with his face.²⁴

"I have very unwisely dashed again into the arena of politics," he wrote a friend, "and for about four weeks have been speaking thirty-six hours in every twenty-four. . . . I sought to bring the old Fillmore men to their senses. I have succeeded. But in this work I was compelled to be a candidate. . . . I have been working in [five

²¹Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Aug. 18, 19, 20, 1858.

²²Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Oct. 7, 1858. Corwin could not fill all the requests made upon him for speeches outside his district. Cleveland *Leader*, Aug. 28, Sept. 1, 1858.

²³Eugene H. Roseboom, *The Civil War Era; 1850-1873 in The History of the State of Ohio* (Columbus, 1944), IV, 337; Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Sept. 2, 1858.

²⁴Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, Sept. 20, 1848; Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Sept. 1, 2, 1858.

other congressional districts], all hotly contested, all doubtful. . . . I go tomorrow (if alive then) to speak each day and night for two weeks."²⁵ This two week tour took him to Illinois, along with Chase, to assist Lincoln in his contest with Douglas; the "Little Giant" responded to this out-of-state opposition by charging Corwin, in the debate with Lincoln at Alton, with having done all he could to aid the enemy during the Mexican War.²⁶ To Lincoln, who had supported Corwin's stand a decade before, the aid must have been welcome.

In all of his campaign speeches Corwin pressed his conservative appeals. Before one rally at Columbus his doctors had forbidden him to speak but, he said, "the sight of a good old fashioned Whig meeting would do more to revive him than any amount of physic," and he spoke for two hours! Generally he signified his acceptance of Republican slavery doctrine, but he was much more conservative than some radicals of the party appreciated in spending time on the need for a high tariff, not only for raising revenue but to encourage the free labor of the North and discourage the slave labor of the South. The "Ironmasters" were shown the economic virtues of Republicanism. The Democratic press declared, after the Columbus speech, that Corwin was still ambiguous: when would he "take a definite stand on the slavery question?" But to the chief Whig organ it was clear that "he endorses fully the doctrines and principles advocated by the Republicans. . . ."²⁷

In a speech at Byron Corwin pictured a territory as a small boy in need of guidance, and Congress as his guardian, with every right to prohibit slavery if it wished. But when the boy matured he was no longer limited by his guardian; so with the territory which reached the legal age of qualifying for statehood; it could no longer be bound by the wishes of Congress. A few days later, at Xenia, he advanced his position by attacking the Dred Scott decision: "If that decision is to be carried out, that the Territories are thus to be innoculated with Slavery and under this unfair influence, a State is formed with a Slave Constitution, and comes before me for admission, I will never

²⁵Corwin to Pike, Sept. 24, 1858, in Picke, *First Blows*, 427.

²⁶Cincinnati *Commercial*, Oct. 19, 21, 24, 1858; John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln*, 12 vols. (New York, 1905), V, 74.

²⁷Columbus *Ohio Statesman*, Sept. 1; Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Sept. 1, 1858.

vote for it! Never! Never! Never! You may roast me alive, I haven't much fat, but it shall all be fried off before I will vote to admit a Slave State under such circumstances."²⁸

For these views Corwin was denounced as a tool of the "Black Republicans . . . to haul in all the suckers," and nominated, said the Democrats, only "to nationalize the Republican party with all the quixotism of his romantic character." Even the radicals of his own party, like fiery Joshua Giddings, denounced him and predicted his defeat for, although he had once been popular, "the syren voice of compromise lulled him to rest. . . ."²⁹ But the prediction was false: not only did Corwin aid a half dozen other congressional candidates to victory, but he won his own election handily; of the twenty-one Ohio congressmen elected, only three on the Western Reserve had larger majorities. Though some of the radical Republicans might still suspect the completeness of Corwin's conversion to their party, in the conservative territory of southern Ohio the eloquent Wagon Boy helped take the sting out of bona fide Republicanism.³⁰ Tom Corwin, last of the Whigs, had come back.

III. NATIONALIZING THE PARTY, 1859

The 36th Congress, elected in the fall of 1858, did not meet until December, 1859. Whig Corwin's chief contribution to his new party in the interim was a series of speeches, in the Ohio gubernatorial campaign, in Indiana, New York, and New Jersey. In them all he continued his efforts to nationalize the Republican party, i.e., interpret its principles in terms which men of all sections might accept. It was the traditional Whig strategy of opposing divisiveness and compromising major issues. This meant that the Republican party must be portrayed as conservative and essentially anti-Jacksonian on economic issues for the sake of Northern interests, and conciliatory on the slavery issue for the supporters of the Southern cause.

In Ohio, the Democrats forsook their traditional role, and de-

²⁸Xenia *Torchlight*, Sept. 15, 29, 1858.

²⁹Columbus *Ohio Statesman*, Aug. 10, Sept. 9, 1858.

³⁰Cincinnati *Commercial*, Oct. 15, 1858; Denny to Chase, Sept. 4, 1858, Chase MSS.; John Hutchins to Giddings, Nov. 20, 1858, Giddings MSS., Ohio Archeological and Historical Society; Giddings to Corwin, in Columbus *Ohio Statesman*, Sept. 4, Oct. 13; Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Oct. 14, 1858.

clared for the Constitution and enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law. Their opponents were divided: in the state convention Giddings and the radicals wanted to attack the constitutionality of the hated law, but Corwin and Campbell, leading the moderates, vetoed the idea. As a result the party platform in 1859 simply called for the repeal of the act; and it omitted any mention of Kansas or slavery extension. Even this compromise crusade for repeal of the law, without attacking its constitutionality, was disapproved by Lincoln,³¹ but the "ultras" of the party were to go even further during the canvass.

Corwin warmed up for the Ohio campaign with a trip to Indiana for two major speeches. One was at a four-state encampment of military companies on July 4th when he dealt but briefly with national issues;³² the other was before a large meeting in Indianapolis when he attempted to find a common ground between North and South on the slavery question. His views were regarded as too conciliatory by some Hoosier Republicans, and in response to an evening "serenade" Corwin tried to appease them by pleading that "the institutions of our country could be secured by the sovereignty of the law."³³

Upon his return from Indiana Corwin plunged into one of the most vigorous campaigns ever waged in Ohio; in few elections, writes one historian, were the issues presented more clearly and ably. The two gubernatorial candidates held a series of debates; Corwin, Chase, Delano, Stanton, Giddings, Sherman, Bingham, Schenck, and a host of others canvassed the entire state; and Lincoln, Douglas, and Lyman Trumbull came over from Illinois to join in.³⁴ Tom Corwin, "a thorn in the flesh of Locofocism wherever he went," made over fifty speeches, covering most of the state, but concentrating in doubtful southern areas where his appeal to the old Whig element would be most useful. "I have been constantly on the stump," he wrote a friend, "*fighting the heresies of Republicanism and the humbugs of Democracy*. The former, I trust, in Ohio, are thoroughly

³¹Roseboom, *Civil War Era*, 350-351.

³²Lafayette *Daily Journal*, July 6, 1859.

³³Portsmouth *Times*, July 26, 1859.

³⁴Roseboom, *Civil War Era*, 354-356; Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Oct. 4, 1858.

expunged from the creed of that party, and the latter, I hope, are somewhat damaged."³⁵

Fighting the "humbugs of Democracy" meant reviving Whiggish conservatism, often to the consternation of some party colleagues. At Xenia, for example, Corwin called for a protective tariff, a decrease in governmental expenditures, federal prosecution of filibusters, and offered his hand to Northern businessmen and Southern sympathizers alike by contending that there were no radical ideas being advocated by the Republican party.³⁶ It required more than mere conservative argument, however, to battle the alleged "heresies of Republicanism." Here a frontal attack was necessary upon the radicals who were asserting their doctrines of "higher law" and "inherent rights" against the Fugitive Law, and by implication, against the Constitution. With the Republicans taking this tack under the lead of Giddings in Ohio and Seward in New York, Southerners would be permanently alienated; if the Constitution, and the laws enacted under it, were superseded by a "higher law," then, indeed, the conflict was irrepressible. Thus Corwin deliberately abused the Western Reserve radicals who advocated disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Law. Again and again he asserted its constitutionality and the obligation of every citizen to obey it. Personally he did not like, would not have voted for it had he been in Congress when it was passed, but "the courts, both state and federal, have decided that this law is not contrary to the United States Constitution, and that Congress had the power to enact that law. . . . This is enough for me and all law-abiding men. We must obey and not resist that law. . . ."³⁷

When Giddings roared that Corwin's plea for obedience was "anti-Republican, anti-Christian, opposed to the honor of our State, liberties of our people, and the rights of mankind," Corwin denounced him as a heretic, not a real leader of the Republican party: "Father Giddings is a good fellow—honest old soul—but subject to fits." Corwin, wrote one editor, "should turn Giddings over to the celebrated doctor he delights to tell of from the stump, who was great

³⁵Lebanon *Western Star*, Oct. 13, 1858; Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Aug. 11, 23, Oct. 1, 1859; Corwin to J. J. Miller, Sept. 25, in New York *Times*, Nov. 1, 1859.

³⁶Xenia *Torchlight*, July 20, 1859.

³⁷Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Aug. 11, Oct. 1; Xenia *Torchlight*, July 20; Columbus *Ohio Statesman*, Sept. 18; Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, Sept. 16, 1859.

on fits, and who could cure any disorder if he could only throw the patient into a fit."³⁸ Giddings retorted that Corwin's views were worse than those of Chief Justice Taney, a sentiment echoed by the abolitionist crusaders of Oberlin College and the radical press.³⁹

This intraparty squabble amused the Democrats, and they gleefully hailed Corwin's views as their own: "Corwin is doing the country and the Democracy good service by presenting to the people some sound views, purely Democratic in character, about the Fugitive-slave law." "He is standing up to the Constitutional compact. . . . We advise you to go and hear him. . . ." ⁴⁰ The Republican managers were not amused: though some party paper praised Corwin for his attack upon the heresies of the radicals,⁴¹ the official journal tried to smooth over the controversy by suggesting that Corwin had not been quoted precisely, that no Republican really believed there were "inherent rights" conflicting with the Constitution, and that the real issue was with the Democratic belief that the Constitution set the limit of human rights.⁴²

Whatever the merits of the conflict within the party, the Republicans again carried Ohio in 1859, with Tom Corwin "doing excellent work for the party in holding the conservatives in line and in abating the impression of radicalism. . . . The result in 1860 was clearly foreshadowed by the vote in 1859."⁴³

In the fall Corwin was invited to New York to campaign for Republicans in that area, and from October 31 to November 8 he made nearly a dozen speeches. Three were major addresses before huge audiences in the city at Lamartine Hall, Brooklyn Musical Hall, and the Cooper Institute; the others were in such cities as Newburgh,

³⁸Giddings to editor, Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Aug. 2; Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, Sept. 16, 1859.

³⁹Letters from Giddings and Samuel Plumb, in Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Sept. 7; Cleveland *Herald*, 1859.

⁴⁰Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, Sept. 10; West Union *Adams County Democrat*, Sept. 2, 1859.

⁴¹Dayton *Journal*, in Lebanon *Western Star*, July 21, 1859.

⁴²Columbus *Ohio State Journal*, Aug. 30, Sept. 7, 1859. The Democrats charged that the apparent Corwin-Giddings conflict was part of a secret plan to appeal to both the northern Ohio radicals and the old Whigs of southern Ohio. See Columbus, *Ohio Statesman*, Sept. 2; Cincinnati *Commercial*, July 18, 1859.

⁴³Roseboom, *Civil War Era*, 354, 356.

Poughkeepsie, Syracuse, and Newark, New Jersey.⁴⁴ As was the case with Lincoln four months later, this was Corwin's first visit to the Empire City, and great crowds came to hear the famous western orator. In Brooklyn the hall was packed with nearly 2,000 people; at Cooper Institute some 5,000 people turned out, of whom only 3,000 could crowd into the hall, where they occupied every seat and filled the windows, aisles, stairways, and platform. Corwin commonly introduced himself to these audiences as "the only representative alive on the face of the earth" of the old Whig party, and proved it by the conservative tone of his speeches and his repeated vindications of the policies of Clay, Webster, and Fillmore.

The Ohio orator's chief plea, while stumping in New York, was for his hearers to ignore the sectional controversy and temper their discussions of the problems growing out of it. He had listened to so much complaint of wrong-doing on both sides, he said, that he had come to the conclusion that man's chief purpose in politics was "to discuss the difference between a white man and a nigger." As he spoke the trial of John Brown was nearing its close in Virginia, and Corwin took it, at Lamartine Hall, as an extended example of his proposition. Ossawatimie Brown and his men were, after all, only lunatics who should be placed in asylums, yet the public agitation over them, both North and South, "could not have been greater had the 400,000 men of the armies of Italy landed at Norfolk!" The Republican party would have no part of such firebrand reformers, and the friends of the South should know it.

In his speech at Brooklyn Musical Hall Corwin took two hours to map out his concept of Republican doctrine in five propositions. First, he declared, came support of the Constitution and the judicial interpretations of it. Second, he upheld the power of Congress to legislate on the slavery question in the territories. This led him, next, to a vigorous attack upon "Popular Sovereignty"; without mentioning Douglas' name, he called the doctrine "the offspring of a distempered brain. Ambition had sought it out, as a mere spring-board by which it might leap to the Presidential chair." He felt sorry for his brother Democrats: the doctrine was "about as ugly as the ground-hog was to the man out west who was laboring under hypochondrias, and

⁴⁴*Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, Oct. 27, Nov. 3; *New York Times*, Nov. 3, 4; *New York Tribune*, Nov. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 1859. The following references to New York speeches are to these sources.

believed that he had given birth to it; in regard to it said that as long as it was his, ugly as it was, he had to love it." Fourth, he urged that the Ordinance of '87, establishing the Northwest Territory, be followed as a pattern for dealing with slavery in the remaining territories. Finally, he declared that the South should be secured in all of her constitutional rights, even to the returning of runaway slaves.

At Cooper Institute Corwin anticipated the line of argument which Lincoln presented from the same platform a few months later; he read the historical record for the views of men of all parties, including the Democrats, down to 1854, who had believed that Congress held the power to legislate on slavery in the territories. Again he attacked the doctrine of "Popular Sovereignty," calling its adoption, with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, an occasion when Congress "pulled down the dyke and let loose the waters of bitterness all over the land." An addition to his previous arguments, in this last New York City address, was a forceful and conservative interpretation of other Republican principles: granting of free public lands, retrenchment in federal expenditure, protective tariff, and a law to prevent filibustering expeditions.

On the whole these New York State meetings were more orderly and dignified than the western party rallies where Corwin's stump speaking skills had been developed since the early Thirties. But while his speeches may have had fewer of the humorous sallies and bits of invective for which he was famous in the midwest, and there was less free give-and-take with the audience, his hearers, by the newspaper accounts, were responsive and enthusiastic. William Cullen Bryant, editor of the *New York Evening Post*, admitted that Corwin held the careful attention of his swarming audiences, but reported that it took all the "unrivalled resources of the eloquent and entertaining orator to garnish the dose he so gravely administered." He dealt only, Bryant complained, with the "commonplace political ABC's which he inculcated with the air of a discoverer," but he was undoubtedly the most "crotchety as well as the most popular of old Whig Republicans." Greeley's *Tribune*, on the other hand, felt that Corwin had done good service in demonstrating that the Republican party held the same ground on slavery as the founding fathers, that its doctrines were even older than the Constitution. Through his speech, wrote the editor, "there radiated the magnetic play of feeling, the genial humor, the felicity of expression, and the occasional

glowing flights of eloquence which have rendered Gov. Corwin's oratory famous. He not merely instructed and convinced, but delighted his vast audience. . . ."45

During his visit to New York Corwin attended Henry Ward Beecher's church, sitting on the platform as he listened, for the first time, to Wendell Phillips. Later he reported that he never heard a speaker use the English language with such terseness and purity; but the ideas of Phillips, in his "Lesson of the Hour," Corwin could not approve. One reporter watched him shake his head as Phillips held Webster and Clay responsible for the Mexican War, and saw his dark face like "a god made wroth" when the abolitionist pronounced the Constitution "a covenant of death and an agreement with hell." When Phillips learned of Corwin's presence that evening he offered to yield the pulpit. The visitor refused the invitation, but apparently agreed to speak another time in Beecher's church.⁴⁶ Late in November, therefore, on his way to the 36th Congress, Corwin returned to New York. His speech, "The American Citizen and His Duties: John Brown's Countenance Through Another Pair of Spectacles," had been given in Lebanon on a lyceum program a week before; now he repeated it from Beecher's pulpit as a reply to Wendell Phillips.⁴⁷

"The Lesson of the hour," Phillips had declared, "is insurrection," and he pointed to John Brown as the first martyr in this "new phase of the great American struggle." Huss, Wickliffe, and Washington, like Brown, had all broken the law, he continued, "but these men broke bad laws . . . and such law-breaking history loves, and God blesses. . . . Whatever argument excuses them, makes John Brown a saint."⁴⁸ Such "reckless invocations of passion and crime" were too much for even some abolitionists to stomach,⁴⁹ and they disturbed Corwin no less. For over a year on the campaign circuit he had

⁴⁵New York *Evening Post*, Nov. 4; New York *Tribune*, Nov. 4, 1859. See, also, Depew, *Eighty Years*, 321-322; New York *Times*, Nov. 3, 4, 1859.

⁴⁶Morrow, *Corwin*, 88; New York *Times*, Nov. 2; New York *Tribune*, Nov. 3, 1859.

⁴⁷Lebanon *Western Star*, Nov. 24, 30; Cleveland *Leader*, in Lebanon *Western Star*, Dec. 1, 1859; Morrow, *Corwin*, 87-88.

⁴⁸See George L. Austin, *The Life and Times of Wendell Phillips* (Boston, 1884), 186.

⁴⁹Boston *Daily Advertiser*, in Boston *Liberator*, Nov. 11; Cleveland *Leader*, Nov. 7, 1859.

been winning conservative support for the Republican party by arguing that the first duty of the citizen is to obey the law, even the Fugitive Slave Law. Now he made this his theme: the "higher law" of God might be argued by some, but man made law was a necessity in a complex civilization, and the law of God required obedience to the laws of the land. "I say every clergyman is under that obligation . . . every man, every woman, and every child. . . . But . . . a gentleman arises up from prayer and says that a law is very wrong; that it commands a wicked thing; that he cannot obey it. There are two alternatives for such a man, exile and the grave. Either of them is very unpleasant to weak humanity."

Thus Corwin reiterated the Cooper Institute arguments. Then, taking up Phillips' second point, what about the alleged martyr, "poor Brown, misguided Brown, crazy Brown?" Those who refused to obey the laws (and here he included William Walker, the Southern filibuster), who tried to live above the law, must be condemned. One cannot make a martyr of a man whose actions are inexcusable. Just because Ossawatimie Brown tells the truth and faces his doom with composure is no reason to canonize him. (Here, said Emerson, is "a new saint who will make the gallows glorious like the cross.") After all, cried Corwin, "Many a highway robber is just as brave as John Brown. Many a highway robber is just as free from lying as John Brown."

Unacceptable as this speech was to many radical abolitionists, its theme was soon accepted by the party: shortly thereafter Seward denounced John Brown, and at Cooper Institute, three months later, Abraham Lincoln disavowed him on behalf of the party. The Harper's Ferry raid had shocked the South as few other events in the long struggle; it was taken as evidence that the abolitionists would never be satisfied with persuasion as a means, and that Republicans were only abolitionists in disguise. That Corwin should be the first Republican leader to repudiate Brown and the abolitionists was a proper climax to his year of campaigning to nationalize the party, to gain conservative support in the North, and to reassure the leaders in the Southern cause.

IV. CAMPAIGN IN CRISIS, 1860

For all practical purposes, the campaign of 1860 began three days after the execution of John Brown, on December 5th, 1859,

when the 36th Congress convened for one of the most quarrelsome sessions in history. For eight weeks the House wrangled over the selection of a speaker. Corwin had nominated his Ohio friend, John Sherman, and the Southerners rebuked the nominee by moving a resolution that no man who had endorsed Hinton Helper's book, *The Impending Crisis of the South*, was fit for the post. Late in January Corwin joined in "this farce which we have been enacting for seven weeks," in an effort to conciliate the conflicting factions and make organization of the House possible. The speech was the longest of his ever reported, running well over two hours on each of two successive days, yet there were cries for him to continue when he stopped. Essentially he said nothing new, his purpose being simply to show that "from the earliest period of our Government down to 1853 everybody — all agreeing to it; all shades of politics; Congresses of every hue of politics; all the courts of the country, all over it — regarded the question of prohibition of slavery in the territories as clearly settled, as the Republicans now hold it." This view he championed before the people in the campaigns of 1858 and 1859; now he brought it to Congress. "I wish this speech of mine," he said, "so far as it goes, imperfect as it is, to be considered as 'Corwin's Apology for Republicanism.'" It was; in the campaign of 1860 his speech became one of the most widely circulated documents, published in two editions by the Republican Congressional Committee with its full endorsement.⁵⁰

Though the House was finally organized under a conservative Republican speaker, little business was conducted; members of both parties were too much concerned with the coming election. The campaign began early for Corwin: he visited Connecticut in March for a dozen addresses, and before the canvass was over he would speak in at least ten states, one of the Republican orators most in demand by local managers. In Connecticut, and at Dover, Delaware, Corwin continued to justify the Republican stand on slavery extension, and emphasized for his Southern friends that just because abolitionists tended to vote Republican did not mean that the party was abolitionist. In addition he stressed two issues significant in these manufacturing states, a high protective tariff, and a western homestead law.

⁵⁰Thomas Corwin, "Vindication of Republican Doctrines," (Washington, 1860; 30 pp. and 16 pp. eds.).

As he wrote to a friend during these tours, he hoped to build a great conservative party, like the Whig, out of the Republican movement.⁵¹

When Corwin returned to Ohio the struggle for control of the Buckeye delegation to the convention was underway; essentially it was a contest between Chase and the conservatives. At the start the Chase opponents centered on Corwin as their favorite, but he supported his old rival, Justice John McLean. When measured against such men as Chase and Seward, the conservative Supreme Court judge was attractive. McLean was "the old men's candidate," and at Chicago Corwin nominated him.⁵² Because the Ohio delegation was so divided among Chase, McLean and Lincoln, it was of little influence in the convention, although when Lincoln needed but one and a half votes after the third ballot they were furnished by the switch of Corwin and three other Ohioans.⁵³

Tom Corwin was well satisfied with the nominee. The two men had known each other in Washington in the Forties where they shared their admiration for Henry Clay; Corwin with his Senate diatribe and Lincoln with his House "Spot Resolutions" opposed the Mexican War; both of them were loyal Whigs. In more recent years they had less direct contact, but their viewpoints were similar on the leading issues of the day: Douglas' "Popular Sovereignty," John Brown's raid, the Dred Scott decision, the Fugitive Slave Law, and the proposed homestead act. And less than two years before Corwin had gone to Illinois to help Lincoln in his campaign against Douglas. Perhaps Corwin was joined to Lincoln, as Sandburg has put it, "by some common touch that ran back to a feeling about masses of people, the many against the few, the ruled-over as against the rulers."⁵⁴

Though Corwin was running for re-election in 1860, he conducted a national campaign, speaking but half a dozen times in his own dis-

⁵¹Lebanon *Western Star*, March 29, April 5; New York *Times*, March 23, 1860; Wilmington, *Delaware Republican*, May 3, 1860, in Reinhard H. Luthin, *The First Lincoln Campaign* (Cambridge, 1944), 67; Corwin to William Schouler, April 28, 1860, *ibid.*, 67.

⁵²Columbus *Ohio Statesman*, Feb. 2, 3, 1860; Francis P. Weisenburger, *The Life of John McLean* (Columbus, 1937), 211-214; William E. Baringer, *Lincoln's Rise to Power* (Boston, 1937), 206; Murat Halstead, *Caucuses of 1860* (Columbus, 1860), 131.

⁵³Halstead, *Caucuses of 1860*, 114.

⁵⁴Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*, 4 vols. (New York, 1939), II, 285.

trict. He spoke extensively in Ohio, but his cross-country campaigning also took him into Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia.⁵⁵ The chief peril of the times, as Corwin viewed it, lay in the "intemperate zeal" of some of the radical Republicans: "Vengeance to the South, and not love of South and North, seems to be the animating principle of too many of those who proclaim themselves the only friends of human rights."⁵⁶ To counter the effect of those who would go too far and too fast on the slavery question by reassuring old Fillmore Whigs in the North and suspicious Southerners of the essential conservatism of the Republican party, was Corwin's chief object in the campaign. Though in Connecticut he might jokingly predict that if the South seceded, traffic on the underground railroad would increase, he pleaded everywhere for obedience to the Fugitive Slave Law, thus setting himself against the "ultras" of the party. And while he might say in Delaware that slavery was a curse, that it carried with it the seeds of destruction for a free press and for free speech, he argued only for the right of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories. With such views he felt Lincoln was in accord, and declared from the stump again and again that the South would have nothing to fear from a Republican administration.⁵⁷

In Indiana Corwin joined with such moderates as Blair of Missouri, and Underwood of Virginia, in Illinois with Gustave Koerner, William Bebb, and Orville H. Browning,⁵⁸ in urging support for the Republican platform, an essentially hard-headed capitalistic and nationalistic program of Whig derivation, designed to unite the industrial Northeast and the agricultural Northwest on issues of tariff, homesteads, and internal improvements. As "the last living Whig on earth," Corwin assured his listeners that "there is not a single

⁵⁵Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Aug. 27, Oct. 9, 26; Cleveland *Leader*, Sept. 15, 28, 1860.

⁵⁶Corwin to Colfax, July (?), 1860, in Ovando J. Hollister, *Life of Schuyler Colfax* (New York, 1886), 145.

⁵⁷New York *Times*, March 23; Lebanon *Western Star*, March 29; Dayton *Journal*, June 7, 1860.

⁵⁸Indianapolis *Daily Sentinel*, Aug. 1860; Charles Zimmerman, *The Rise of History*, XIII (1917), 394; Thomas J. McCormack, ed., *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner, 1809-1896*, 2 vols. (Cedar Rapids, 1900), II, 101; Theodore C. Pease and James G. Randall, eds., *The Diary of Orville Hickman Browning* (Springfield, 1927-33), 432-433.; Springfield *Illinois State Journal*, Oct. 15, 1860.

political principle in our Republican creed, to which every old Whig cannot subscribe."⁵⁹

One editor wrote that Corwin's speeches in the campaign never seemed "to excite prejudic, or stir up ill blood, or to attempt to impose on the confidence or mislead the judgment of men. His object is rather to still the troubled waters, to appeal to the reason and the conscience of men. . . ." ⁶⁰ This was a happy sentiment, but less than the whole truth. Though Corwin always appealed to all men to vote, whether they supported his candidate or not, as in his speeches in Pennsylvania and Virginia,⁶¹ he was far short of being nonpartisan. He aroused the Democrats to make bitter partisan attacks upon him, particularly in Illinois,⁶² and despite his moderate views on slavery he was often classed by the opposition with the abolitionists.⁶³ The best measure of his value to the party, perhaps, was the concern of his radical colleagues, such as Giddings, Chase, and Julian, that he represented "superficial and only half-developed Republicanism."⁶⁴ Tom Corwin's appeals were addressed to the old Fillmore Whigs, American party men, and antislavery Democrats. Someone had to take the sting out of radical Republicanism if these voters were to be won.

The campaign of 1860, in which Corwin easily won re-election in his own district, contributed largely to carrying Ohio for Lincoln,⁶⁵ and aided the ticket in ten states, was his last appearance as a stump speaker. His career had marked a milestone in the history of political campaigning, for he was one of the first great party orators to take to the country crossroads, one of the founders of the American

⁵⁹New York *Tribune*, July 14, 1860.

⁶⁰Dayton *Journal*, June 7, 1860.

⁶¹Reports in Josiah Morrow MSS., Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio.

⁶²Interview with Dr. William H. Corwin, Chicago *Tribune*, March 20, 1879.

⁶³Cecil County, Md., corresp. to New York *Tribune*, Oct. 26, 1860.

⁶⁴See George W. Julian, *Political Recollections, 1840-1872* (Chicago, 1884), 177.

⁶⁵Horace Greeley, ed., *Whig Almanac* (New York, 1861), 59; Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Oct. 26, 1860; Theodore C. Smith, *History of the Republican Party in Ohio*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1898), I, 128-129.

political tradition of stump speaking.⁶⁶ In 1860 he served his new party, and Whiggery, with his most effective weapon.

V. THE LAST WHIG COMPROMISE, 1861

After Lincoln's election the 36th Congress reconvened. Without completely comprehending what it saw, the North watched the culmination of the years of talk about disunion; but in Washington the old Clay men believed that still one more compromise could save the Union. After listening to Buchanan's message on the perilous state of the Union the House moved to establish a select committee of thirty-three members, one from each state, to attempt conciliation. Most Southerners refrained from voting, and every negative vote was cast by a Republican, but when Corwin was appointed chairman of the committee there was greater optimism in the capital than for weeks: "Gov. Corwin . . . is disposed to advance conciliatory measures. . . . Every one now hopes for the best, and better things will occur within a fortnight than the most ultra of either side anticipate."⁶⁷ Indeed, if disliking Democrats and distrusting abolitionists made a man neutral, Corwin was the best of all possible chairmen. Yet the assignment was an impossible one; what went on in the committee tug-of-war between the abolitionists and the proslavery men was best described by Corwin in a letter to Lincoln: "If the States are no more harmonious in their feelings & opinions than these 33 representative men, then, appalling as the idea is, we must dissolve & a long & bloody civil war *must* follow. . . . Southern men are theoretically crazy. Extreme Northern men are practical fools. The latter are really quite as mad as the former. . . ."⁶⁸

Nevertheless, the committee finally reported proposals to admit New Mexico as a slave state, to adopt a constitutional amendment which would forever protect slavery where it existed, and to urge the states to repeal the personal liberty laws which interfered with the Fugitive Slave Law. On January 21 Corwin made his last major

⁶⁶See J. Jeffery Auer, "Tom Corwin: 'King of the Stump,'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXX (1944), 47-55.

⁶⁷*Cong. Globe*, 36th Cong., 2 Sess., 6; *New York Times*, Dec. 7; *New York Herald*, Dec. 8, 1860.

⁶⁸Corwin to Lincoln, Jan. 18, 1861, in David C. Mearns, *The Lincoln Papers* 2 vols. (New York, 1948), II 406.

speech in Congress, "an anxious old patriot, the faithful disciple of the Whig school of compromisers . . . imploring his hearers to accept what he thought necessary for the salvation of his country. . . . It was a memorable scene: the last pathetic gasp of the policy of compromise."⁶⁹ Only two years after he first came to Congress, Corwin recalled, the nullification crisis was precipitated by South Carolina. Now "at the near termination of my natural life, and the still nearer approach to the close of political service . . .," he said, "We are called on to exhaust every means possible to accomplish a peaceful adjustment of present difficulties. . . . My mission to-day is one of conciliation, peace. If grievances, real or imaginary are presented to me . . . I am ready to consider them, and employ every resource within my power to remove or redress wrong, if wrong has been done; to soothe anger if it exists; to remove unfounded prejudices, or explain unhappy misunderstandings; to heal wounds if there be any; not to irritate and intensify them; if danger is apprehended to the rights of any portion of the people, I am ready to shield them from even the apprehension of danger, by fortifying their rights with further constitutional guarantees. . . ."⁷⁰ But though history was swinging through the same cycle, this time it was to be thrown off course. That night, in his rooms, Corwin confessed to Carl Schurz that "I think myself that all the efforts for compromise will come to nothing. I have done the best I could, but on both sides they are like bull-dogs eager for the fray."⁷¹

As the Republicans had killed the "Crittenden Compromise" in the Senate, so the Southerners rejected the proposals of Corwin's committee in the House. Then on February 27 the recommendations of the Virginia Peace Conference were submitted to Congress; offering nothing better than a rewording of the Crittenden proposals, they were rejected. Once again the House, now willing to make a final effort to prevent the inevitable, turned to Corwin. He phrased his committee's best proposal into a thirteenth amendment to the Constitution: "No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of any State."

⁶⁹Carl Schurz, *Reminiscences*, 3 vols. (New York, 1907), II, 213-214.

⁷⁰*Cong. Globe & Appendix*, 36th Cong., 2 sess., 73-75, 156 ff.

⁷¹Schurz, *Reminiscences*, II, 214.

The House approved the "Corwin Amendment" by a two-to-one vote; the Senate did the same, and it received a hasty signature from Buchanan.⁷² "It was the last effort of Congress to disarm the rebellion, which was already in full panoply, listening not for Congressional resolves but for the word of command."⁷³ Though Lincoln incorporated a last-minute approval of the amendment in his inaugural address, it was rejected in the New England states and ratified only by Maryland and Ohio, but then after the firing on Fort Sumter.

This final effort of Tom Corwin, the old Whig, to lead his new party to compromise, earned him the distrust and hatred of the radicals.⁷⁴ As we have seen, despite the debt of the party to Corwin for his great services since 1858, the abolitionist wing feared his innate Whiggery. If, as was freely predicted by political observers, he were appointed to Lincoln's cabinet,⁷⁵ all the radicals had fought for might be lost through the influence upon Lincoln of a "Fossil Whig." Undoubtedly the president-elect was aware of these fears, though he had reason to know that Corwin favored the radical Seward for a cabinet post, as well as moderates Smith and Bates.⁷⁶ In any event, there is no evidence that Corwin was ever seriously considered for the cabinet. Lincoln had other work for Corwin, a position for which he was peculiarly fitted.

Among the incongruities of 1861 was the fact that the Minister to Mexico would hold America's key diplomatic post;⁷⁷ "perhaps the most interesting and important one within the whole circle of our

⁷²*Cong. Globe*, 36th Cong., 2 Sess., 1285, 1403.

⁷³*New York Times*, Dec. 19, 1865.

⁷⁴See Schurz to J. F. Potter, Dec. 17, 1860, in Frederick Bancroft, ed., *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz* 6 vols. (New York, 1913), I, 168-170; Henry Adams to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., Dec. 22, 1860, in Worthington C. Ford, ed., *Letters of Henry Adams 1858-1891*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1930), I 70; *Cleveland Leader*, Dec. 18, 1860; *Boston Liberator*, Feb. 15, 1861.

⁷⁵*St. Louis Missouri Republican*, Nov. 15, 1860, in Baringer, *House Dividing*, 64; *New York Herald*, Nov. 29, Dec. 15; *New York Times*, Nov. 30, 1860.

⁷⁶Corwin to Lincoln, Jan. 18, 1861, in Mearns, *Lincoln Papers*, II, 406.

⁷⁷Carl Schurz to Mrs. Schurz, March 28, 1861, in Joseph Schafer, ed., *Intimate Letters of Carl Schurz, 1841-1869*, in *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (Madison, 1928), XXX, 252-253.

international relations," wrote Secretary of State Seward.⁷⁸ France and England were the chief consumers of Southern cotton and, in the event of a Union blockade, Mexico could be the only gateway for continuing the important trade. Cherishing bitter memories of the Forties, Mexico might be willing to aid the Confederacy against the North. Moreover, the winning of Mexican friendship was a focal point of Confederate diplomacy: Southern leaders reasoned that if France could be persuaded that the Civil War nullified the Monroe Doctrine, she might intervene in Mexico; then Southern support for Napoleon III might win diplomatic recognition for the Confederate States. And if France recognized the South, Great Britain would surely follow. Thus a diplomatic triumph for the Confederacy in Europe might be born in Mexico.⁷⁹ To secure this result the Confederacy sent handsome Colonel John Pickett, soldier of fortune, newspaperman, and former consul at Vera Cruz, as envoy to Mexico. Lincoln needed an even better man.

In the first week of his administration Lincoln discussed the Mexican mission with Corwin, asking him to recommend a candidate, but without suggesting that Corwin, himself, might be under consideration. Three days later, however, Lincoln nominated him.⁸⁰ There was no other man in the United States, Lincoln knew, half as acceptable to the Mexican government as Tom Corwin. In the Forties over a third of Mexico's territory had been taken by the United States; in the Fifties every American minister to that depsoiled nation had been a Southern slaveowner and Manifest Destiny man, all suspected of wanting to slice off still more Mexican soil. Of all Yankees the Mexicans knew only one as a friend, the man who had told the Senate, in 1847, "If I were a Mexican I would tell you, 'Have you not room in your own country to bury your dead men? If you come into mine we will greet you with bloody hands, and welcome you to hospitable graves.'" To make Tom Corwin Minister to Mexico would be more than the payment of a political debt for his valuable party services in three critical campaigns; it would be a

⁷⁸William H. Seward to Corwin, April 6, 1861, Instructions from the Secretary of State to the United States Minister to Mexico, *Senate Executive Documents*, No. 1, 37 Cong., 2 Sess., I, 67.

⁷⁹See Burton J. Hendrick, *Statesmen of the Lost Cause: Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet* (New York, 1939), 108-117.

⁸⁰Lebanon *Western Star*, March 21, 1861.

shrewd move toward stabilizing a dangerous situation. Thus Lincoln made what has been called his "most iridescent appointment."⁸¹ The story of Corwin's victorious diplomatic duel with Pickett may be summarized in a bitter Southern complaint: "Through the influence of Mr. Corwin . . . the tone of the Juarez Government . . . has been hostile to our cause, and at his dictation various measures have been initiated, calculated to annoy and injure us They have finally decreed martial law on their frontiers, forbid the export or import of any article whatever from Texas, and closed their custom-houses, &c" ⁸²

Tom Corwin's service as Minister to Mexico was the last he could render to the Union he had always loved more than section or party. With it he completed the full cycle of Whiggery. Though not an abolitionist, he led the opposition to the Mexican War in 1847, believing that expansion of territory would inevitable lead to conflict over extension of slavery. Though he was an antislavery man, he refused to accept the leadership offered him by the abolitionists in 1848, supported instead a Southern slaveholder for president, and approved the general purposes of the Compromise of 1850. These acts were all part of good Whig doctrine: support the Union at all costs, by opposing divisive movements, and by compromising when necessary. When the Whig party could no longer sustain its own strategy, Corwin carried it into the Republican party. Again he opposed the extremism of the radical abolitionists and was influential in leading the old line Whigs into Republican ranks; and again he wore the mantle of Henry Clay in proposing a compromise with the South in the final weeks of peace. The "last of the Whigs" was a Whig to the last.

⁸¹Jay Monaghan, *Diplomat in Carpet Slippers: Abraham Lincoln Deals with Foreign Affairs* (Indianapolis, 1945), 69. The appointment was generally praised in the North. See *New York Tribune*, March 13; *Lebanon Western Star*, March 21, 1861.

⁸²Brigadier-General H. P. Bee, C. S. A., to Lieut. Col. S. S. Anderson, C. S. A., Nov. 30, 1862, *The War of the Rebellion . . . Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1886), Series I, Vol. XV, 881-882. For a more detailed account of Corwin's mission, see J. Jeffery Auer, "Lincoln's Minister to Mexico," *Ohio Archeological and Historical Quarterly*, 59 (April 1950), 115-128.

THE MISSISSIPPI YOUTH CONGRESS

PAUL D. BRANDES*

Henry Adams, in speaking of his career at Cambridge in the 1850's, concluded that "no one took Harvard College seriously. All went there because their friends went there, and the College was their ideal of social self-respect." This Henry Adams, whose grandfather, John Quincy Adams, held the first Boylston Chair of Rhetoric at Harvard, might be speaking of the attitude of the general public toward many of our major institutions of higher learning today. Certainly state legislatures do not take state colleges seriously, and denominational schools are often dismissed as propaganda agencies for a particular religion. Occasionally a medical school experiments with a tooth decay preventive and makes the headlines, or an atomic scientist is quoted in the press concerning the possibilities of nuclear research. Eisenhower and Stassen become college presidents, and Dr. Frank Graham is appointed to the United States Senate.

But can we say that our college, its functions, its purposes, its teachings, is being taken seriously by the citizens who surround it and support it financially and by the students who attend it? Or are the Henry Adams still enrolling for social self-respect without once having considered or discovered what a college education may do for them?

A very interesting book called *The Saber Toothed Curriculum* by Harold Benjamin, carefully warns those concerned with teaching, against the danger of trying to stop atom bombs by waving torches in front of caged tigers. And Mr. Benjamin would certainly admit that the classroom, by its very nature, must remain somewhat akin to torch waving. The situation is artificial, even to the extent that the stage fright which a speech student may have put under control before fellow students returns the first time he appears in front of another group. Such artificiality decreases the effectiveness of the classroom in the degree to which it is present. Artificiality in any field is seldom taken seriously by the surrounding parties. Each branch of learning has its own problem in finding means to vitalize-

*Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Mississippi.

its work. Let us consider for a moment the efforts made in this direction in the field of speech.

In the drama division, the lessons the students learn in the classroom are to some extent transferred to the college stage, where fiction becomes reality, at least for an evening, and the theme of the play is grafted into the lives of its many listeners. Interpreters find their recital audiences, and radio students tap wires to local stations. Speech correctionists and voice scientists examine the patients brought to the clinic. All of this is in some measure practical and is largely taken seriously.

But what about the forensic student? Much of the classroom work is in itself real and meaningful, and class projects help to vitalize the theory. However, the extra-class activities are far from satisfactory. True there is an occasional oratorical contest with three to fifteen contestants whose medals are larger than the audiences they address. The public speaker clears his throat to cohorts at campus speech clubs or the so-called individual events at speech tournaments, while debaters wag their statistical fingers before other debaters busy shuffling note cards. Newspapers, college administrators, and the public at large are often sympathetic but not concerned. It is just so much more "torch-waving," because the audiences that form the saber-toothed tigers have had their teeth removed, or at least parked outside until the contest is over.

College and university speech departments throughout the nation have endeavored in many ways to have their students of forensics taken seriously, and to have the students themselves realize the importance of their work. Miami University and the University of Cincinnati are among the many schools having speakers' bureaus of significance wherein students are sent to local communities to discuss problems with civic groups. The University of Vermont offers discussion and debate programs on a variety of subjects to interested parties within a certain radius of their school, and many institutions, including some in the South such as Tennessee, Florida, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Alabama, and Mississippi have organized intramural programs which assist in vitalizing the forensic activity at their schools.

In Mississippi, in the spring of 1948, following the first post-war state speech tournament, the Mississippi Speech Association, upon a suggestion by Mississippi Southern's J. Dale Welsh, elected to in-

augurate the following year a speech congress, to be attended by interested high schools and colleges in the state. The impracticability of the tournament procedure for Mississippi was agreed upon, particularly in view of the limited number of teachers of speech at work in the state. The Association, in mass meeting, approved of the seriousness of a speech congress. C. M. Getchell of the University of Mississippi, then president of the Mississippi Speech Association, appointed a chairman of the first congress, which was held in Jackson on February 17, 18, and 19, on the campus of Millsaps College, with nine high schools and seven colleges and junior colleges in attendance. The Second Mississippi Youth Congress took place in Jackson on December 2 and 3 in the state Capitol buildings and nearby Central High School, with increased numbers present in both houses.

The results of the first two congresses were not appraised and weighed by any research specialist, although such a project would undoubtedly be profitable. However, it can be said with assurance that attending coaches and students agreed upon the seriousness of the experiment. State and local officials interested themselves enough to condemn it, praise it, associate it with fascist and communistic movements, and to officially approve of it by a joint legislative resolution. In light of these developments, it may be well to see what such a project may do for the Henry Adamases of any state in the Union.

The proponents of the Mississippi Youth Congress can claim the following advantages for their experiment:

1. It furnishes opportunity for a variety of forensic activity organized by a central theme.
2. It furnishes an appropriate audience and situation for each of the various forensic activities it permits.
3. It allows all high schools and colleges in the state to meet together on an equal basis, regardless of the stress permitted speech in any particular institution, and its operation allows a school to bring both beginners and experienced personnel without that school feeling any loss of prestige.
4. It familiarizes its participants with contemporary issues and allows coaches to encourage research on a variety of subjects.
5. It acquaints its participants with legislative procedure and encourages enlightened interest in government.

6. In general, it permits all students to witness the outstanding performances of the Congress, and therefore follows the recommendations of St. Augustine in regard to the proper way to gain proficiency in rhetoric.⁴

The Congress is organized so that high school students form the House, each school being allowed to send as many as five delegates. Colleges and junior colleges make up the Senate, eight Senators permitted from any one school. The schedule of events follows in general the sequence below:

FIRST DAY (Friday)

Registration

First Joint Session (clarification of procedure and announcement of last minute changes, particularly in committee assignments)

First Individual Session and First Coaches Meeting (held simultaneously; first sessions are led by appointed students, preferably officers in past congresses, and these

¹*The Education Of Henry Adams: An Autobiography* (Boston, 1918), 54.

²High schools participating in the First Mississippi Youth Congress were Central (Jackson), Clarksdale, Gulfport, Hattiesburg, Lee (Columbus), McComb, Philadelphia, Tupelo, and the Preparatory Department of Whitworth College (Brookhaven). Colleges and junior colleges in attendance were Belhaven College, Mississippi College, Mississippi Southern College, Millsaps College, Southwest Junior College, the University of Mississippi, and Whitworth College.

³House Concurrent Resolution No. 9, passed by the House of Representatives on November 23, 1949, and by the Senate on November 28, 1949, contained the following parts to the preamble: "Whereas, it is the intent and purpose of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi to encourage and to develop an interest in state government in the State of Mississippi: and . . . Whereas, the Mississippi Youth Congress in recent years has contributed to the welfare of the youth of our state and thereby to the welfare of the State of Mississippi by stimulating in these youths a growing interest in the operation of our state government . . ."

The Honorable Heber Ladner, Secretary of State of Mississippi, addressed the first joint meeting of the First Mississippi Youth Congress, warmly expressed his approval of the project, and congratulated the first delegates on their opportunities.

⁴For this admonition of St. Augustine, "the man who wishes to speak not only with wisdom but also with eloquence . . . I rather send to read or hear the eloquent, and to imitate them by practice, than advise to give his time to professors of rhetoric . . ." see, Sister Therese Sullivan, (trans.), *De Doctrina Christiana Liber Quartus*, by St. Augustine (Washington, 1930), 61.

leaders have the title of each bill read, together with the name of the committee to which the appointed clerks have referred it; coaches receive instructions and judging assignments)

First Committee Meetings

Second Individual Sessions (devoted to nominating and campaign speeches, and the subsequent voting for a speaker of the house and presidents pro-tem of the Senate)

Banquet

Second Committee Meetings

Third Individual Sessions (consideration of legislation begins)

SECOND DAY (Saturday)

Fourth Individual Sessions

Third Committee Meetings

Fifth Individual Sessions (usually broken by lunch; students vote in each house on best campaign staged, and usually consider a number of congratulatory and commendatory resolutions, which may be introduced from the floor)

Second Joint Session (survey of achievements, report of statistician, and issuance of superior certificates)

Second Coaches Meeting (discussion and collection of criticisms)

The director of the Congress appoints two clerks and a parliamentarian for each House, and pages and a statistician for the congress as a whole. These are drawn from schools which have certified their intentions to attend, and are carefully selected by the local sponsors for efficiency and knowledge of procedure. One clerk in each House should be able to take short-hand. Sponsors include committee preferences for each of their delegates on the advance registration blanks, and from these suggestions, the director of the Congress makes up the committees. These affiliations are available for distribution during registration and can be clarified at the first joint session. The director also appoints a faculty committee to assist him with entertainment, publicity, and other matters.

The Congress requires two large assembly halls and fourteen committee rooms which are available at all times. Each school must submit three bills which are filed with the clerk at the time of registration. The student clerks refer these bills to appropriate committees. For both sessions, the Congress has formed education, social welfare, commerce, internal affairs, foreign affairs, military and naval

affairs, and conservation of natural resources committees in both Houses.

The judging load on attending coaches is light. In fact, the directors of the Congress have not had to require that a faculty member attend with each group and have found this helpful in stimulating attendance, particularly from small schools. Attending judges are divided into two groups. One group must attend all sessions of a particular House when legislation is being considered, high school coaches judging the Senate and college coaches judging in the House. The other group hears the nominating and campaign speeches and meets in a body to survey all the bills presented. The students themselves, at the last individual session, vote on which school in their House staged the best campaign for the election of the speaker of the House or the president pro-tem of the Senate.

Superior ratings, and only superior ratings, are assigned by the judges in the following fields with a judge being free to give as few or as many superiors as he chooses:

- a. Bills submitted, attention being directed to the form and the content. The director sends to each school a form for bills which specifies, among other things, that each bill shall be no longer than one page.
- b. Outstanding single speeches from the floor, given during majority or minority reports, by the authors of bills when speaking for their resolutions, etc
- c. Nominating speeches, with each school being permitted one nominating speech
- d. Campaign speeches, with each school being permitted one campaign speech
- e. Debating, as demonstrated from the floor of the Congress
- f. Knowledge of parliamentary law, as demonstrated from the floor of the Congress

One superior is given in each House for the best campaign staged, as determined by a plurality of the votes cast by the students.

Robert's Rules of Order has been used as a guide for parliamentary procedure, but it has been found clumsy and confusing, since so many editions of the rules are available. It has been suggested that this be replaced with the *Senior Manual for Group Leadership* by O. Garfield Jones.⁵ The customary legislative pro-

⁵O. Garfield Jones, *Senior Manual For Group Leadership* (New York, 1949).

cedure is followed, without strict observance of either national or local variations. Exceptions to the usual legislative rules are that bills passed by the first House go directly to the floor of the Second House, without being referred to a committee, and that the conference committees are composed of the chairmen of the committees of the respective Houses. Occasionally the rules are suspended to allow the author of a Senate bill to explain his bill to the House and vice-versa.

At the conclusion of the Congress, each coach is asked to criticize the procedure on a blank given him with his registration forms and to make a general statement concerning the worth of the experiment. At the final coaches meeting, these suggestions are discussed orally before the coaches hand in their blanks, and the director of the Congress edits and publishes these suggestions, together with a detailed statistical report of the works of the Congress, which he gathers largely from the report of the statistician. This report is sent to all important educational officials in the state, to all members of the Mississippi Speech Association, and to all Senators and Representatives of the Mississippi legislature.

This year some of the suggestions concerning ways to improve the Congress which were approved by the final coaches meeting were (1) to increase the length of the Congress to three days; (2) to allow each school to submit only one bill and that this bill be sent to the director of the Congress in advance so that he in turn may notify all delegates at least one week in advance of the subject matter to be discussed at the Congress and the personnel of the various committees;⁶ (3) that a coach sit in on each committee meeting and that superior ratings be given for committee work; (4) that the coaches stress that those students who are placed in nomination for speaker of the House or president pro-tem of the Senate must know something about parliamentary procedure; (5) that if possible, a short briefing in parliamentary law and the by-laws of the Congress take place before the first individual sessions.

The various types of forensic activity indulged in are as follows:

ORATORY: Nominating and campaign speeches are formal and well-documented. The audience to which these are de-

⁶This procedure is followed by Rhode Island State College in its "Model Congresses." See *The Speaker*, XXII (May, 1950), 1-6.

livered is large, and all students in any one House have the opportunity to witness all of these speeches. The time permitted each author of a bill which reaches the floor and the majority and minority reports of the committees could also be construed as "oratory."

EXTEMPORE SPEAKING: The floor of the House is open to this much of the time, and a good audience is always available. Students often come prepared to one session with notes they have drawn up on a bill discussed in committee the day before.

IMPROMPTU SPEAKING: The floor of the House is open to impromptu speeches at appropriate times provided that the delegate can secure recognition from the chair. An audience is available for these presentations.

PARLIAMENTARY LAW: Appointed parliamentarians insist on proper and orderly procedure, and students soon learn that those delegates informed in legislative procedure achieve more success than their uninformed colleagues.

DISCUSSION: The three sets of committee meetings are good examples of practical committee work.

DEBATE: Practical debating occurs frequently. It often arises from the reports of the majority and minority committee factions, and progress from there to involve the entire assembly.⁷

The directors of the Congress have noted the following interesting developments:

1. The enthusiasm of the students is superior
2. Coaches do not dodge judging assignments, are not overworked, and are also enthusiastic.
3. The directors find that much of their work can be done in advance, and the suspense of the usual tournament is not present.
4. Participation in the Congresses has been very encouraging, particularly in Mississippi where there are few full-time teachers of speech and speech programs. This year

⁷It has been suggested that formal debates could be staged on designated bills by competing schools, arranged in advance with each school being given the opportunity of taking the negative or affirmative on a bill which is to be discussed. If that were done, it would be necessary to limit bills to one from a school in order that each school's debaters could perform. It would also be necessary to require that bills could not be killed in committee, but must come to the floor for action.

Although this could be done, it has not been considered necessary.

eight of the nine senior colleges sent delegations, and three junior colleges were represented, making eleven institutions of higher learning participating. Thirteen high schools attended the second year, and eight the first. Of those eight, six returned the second year.⁸

Student congresses are run at the national conventions of several of the forensic fraternities, and at some of the regional speech conventions, including the Southern. A description of the high school and college events conducted at Rhode Island State College at Kingston may be found in the May, 1950, issue of Tau Kappa Alpha's *The Speaker*. Information on the West Point Student Conference on United States Affairs may be obtained by writing Lt. Colonel Chester L. Johnson at the Academy,⁹ and on the Ohio State Conference on Public Affairs by contacting Professor H. F. Harding at Columbus.

This article is written to acquaint interested parties with the findings of the Mississippi Youth Congresses. It seems unnecessary here to refer to the many post-war discussions of the perennial problems of the speech tournament. H. P. Constans' "The Role of Intercollegiate Debate Tournaments in the Post-War Period,"¹⁰ and Wayne Eubank's "A View of the Forensic Situation,"¹¹ are excellent examples of the inspection being given the typical contest procedure. The general attitude of those attending the Mississippi Congresses has been that many of the pitfalls of the customary tournaments are successfully avoided. Letters of approval are on file from high school and college teachers from all over the state, and there has been no

⁸High school delegations in the second Congress were from Biloxi, Central (Jackson), George S. Gardiner (Laurel), Hattiesburg, Lee (Columbus), McComb, Natchez, Pascagoula, Pearl, Philadelphia, Tupelo, University (Oxford), and the Preparatory Department of Whitworth College (Brookhaven). Senate delegations were from Belhaven College, Delta State Teachers College, Millsaps College, Mississippi College, Meridian Junior College, Mississippi Southern College, Mississippi State College, Mississippi State College For Women, University of Mississippi, Southwest Junior College, and Whitworth College.

⁹See Chester L. Johnson, "The West Point Conference On United States Affairs," *The Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 36 (April, 1950), 226-231.

¹⁰H. P. Constans, "The Role Of Intercollegiate Debate Tournaments In The Post War Period," *The Southern Speech Journal*, XV (September, 1949), 38-44.

¹¹Wayne C. Eubank, "A View Of The Forensic Situation," *ibid.*, XIV (November, 1948), 108-114.

request from any quarter that Mississippi return to the tournament style. This seems noteworthy. A high school debate tournament is sponsored in Mississippi by the Mississippi High School Association, and festivals and tournaments are conducted by Mississippi Southern College, Millsaps College, and Mississippi State College for Women. The Congresses are not in conflict with any of these, and serve to promote interest in them. Dr. E. S. Wallace, Registrar of Millsaps College and Director of the Millsaps Warm-Up Tournament, has gone on record as saying that the congresses had done more than any other single thing in increasing interest in forensic work on the Millsaps campus.

To be taken seriously is a great step towards being properly appreciated. The dynamic and vital quality of the congress type of activity assists greatly in gaining proper recognition for forensic work with student groups, with governmental officials, and with college administrators. This year's mockers become next year's officials. Next year's officials must be properly trained, with appropriate audiences and wholesome attitudes by all concerned with their training. It would be foolish to infer that if Henry Adams had just attended the Mississippi Youth Congress, he would not have spent the rest of his life searching for an education. However, any step towards the vitalization of a scholastic program assists in giving the participants a firmer grasp on the purposes and power of learning, and assists in securing the proper attitude on the part of the general public towards education. The Mississippi Speech Association hopes that it has contributed to this process.

FOLLOW-UP OF FOUR APHASIC CHILDREN

LOUISE D. DAVISON*

The term aphasia or disphasia applies to a wide range of disabilities in which the individual experiences difficulty in the functions of speaking, reading and writing, or he may lack comprehension of language. This condition may range from a complete lack of speech to an abundance of speech which may be only meaningless jargon. The child may repeat everything said to him, parrot fashion, yet have no comprehension or thought transference in speech.

The child with no speech at all is often diagnosed as a deaf child. Since speech has no meaning for him, he has ceased to listen to it and often has conditioned himself against it. The ones between these two types are more difficult to diagnose and because of their partial use of language and partial understanding, are often termed feeble-minded.

The aphasic condition or language disturbance is caused by damage to the association area of the brain cortex. This damage may occur before birth, at time of birth, or may be due to some accident or disease later in life. Hemorrhages, anoxia, infectious diseases such as encephalitis or meningitis, or very high temperatures can cause this condition.

There are several types of aphasia that must be noted. I have chosen Weisenberg and McBride's classification. One type is known as the predominantly expressive type in which the child is unable to express ideas in writing or speech, sentence structure is impaired, and articulation is faulty.

In the predominantly receptive type there may be little impairment in the speech but the child has difficulty understanding speech and writing. In the expressive-receptive type, all language processes are involved and the individual is extremely limited. The amnesic type has difficulty in thinking of names of objects and in these cases, speech is usually good and there is no grammatical confusion.

Development of language for the aphasic is a long and tedious

*Director, Davison School of Speech Correction, Atlanta, Georgia.

task. Our approach is concentrated on three tracts: feeling, seeing, and hearing. If the problem is receptive-auditory aphasia, we concentrate on the visual and kinesthetic tracts as we build up the auditory. In visual aphasia, the emphasis is on moto-kinesthetic and auditory tracts, while the visual is being developed, and likewise when there is expressive or motor aphasia, concentration is on the visual and auditory areas until association can be built and strengthened in the motor areas. The aphasic child has not acquired any of the information children usually gather through questions and answers and so has to be taught everything through a planned program. We begin with commands, such as bow, clap your hands, jump, etc., action words that can be dramatized. Speech sounds are taught as they develop in nouns, then verbs, prepositions and other parts of speech. Associations have to be built in all areas. The number concept, time, days of the weeks, seasons, distance, etc., and other material of this sort is practically limitless.

Following are the case histories of four predominantly receptive aphasic children.

Case 1. K.

K. was born March 2, 1933. She is one of fraternal twins, born first, breech delivery. There were no convulsions. In addition to her twin, K. has an older sister and a half sister, all normal.

The family history is negative. Her developmental progress was a little slow but within normal range except that her speech did not develop. She had whooping cough at 16 months. She is left handed. Our diagnosis was predominantly receptive aphasia, with no hearing loss.

In August, 1938 (age 5-5), she was taken to a psychiatrist and given the Revised Binet and Minnesota Pre-School tests. The psychologist who did the testing stated only partial cooperation was obtained. "Eventually it was possible to get her to try most of the tests, of which she succeeded with enough to give a minimum rating of I.Q. equivalent 78 (non-verbal). Her performance on this scale of tests (Minnesota Pre-School) was about that of a child of 4 years, 3 months. On two single performance tests, Manikin and Sequin Formboard, she rated at the 5 year and 5½ year levels (quite normal for her chronological age). On the basis of the two sessions I had

with K., I should feel quite safe in . . . the assumption that any gross lack of intellectual capacity was ruled out as a factor responsible for her behavior."

K. entered the Davison School of Speech Correction in September 1938 (age 5-6). At that time she had much jabber but used no intelligible speech. The only words she had were "O, Mama, O," sung to the tune of "The Farmer in the Dell." Her wants were made known by gestures. She had excellent rhythm. She lacked spatial relationships. Her attention and memory span were short. She was an extremely troublesome, nervous, destructive and emotional child. She would swing from one violent emotion to another, yet she was a very pretty child and made friends easily.

Although K. entered the Davison School as a boarding pupil, at the request of her parents, she was sent to a nearby kindergarten for the morning session, as the parents wanted her to be thrown with normal children. She remained in the kindergarten most of the school year but found it quite difficult to meet the social situations there without speech.

While she was in kindergarten, a speech program was also carried on for her at the Davison School. Her training consisted of developing speech elements, then words, phrases, sentences, prepositions, etc. Her comprehension had to be built on all material presented.

Her progress was rather slow at first, but in three months' time she had learned most of the speech elements, could read a number of noun cards and such simple sentences as "I see—" and "I want—." When she was at home during the Christmas holidays, she forgot quite a bit of what she had learned, and it required nearly a month to rebuild her self-confidence and relearn the material lost. She was very slow in learning the number concept. She learned to write without difficulty.

With the development and use of speech, there was an outlet for her emotions; consequently quite an improvement was noted in the emotional instability and nervousness. She presented *no* disciplinary problem, though at first she was quite a behavior problem.

In 1939 she was tested at the Davison School, and on the Revised Stanford-Binet Scale (Form L) she rated an I.Q. of 74. I quote from a summary of this report: "This test would indicate borderline intelligence. It is interesting to note how clear-cut the failures are from the successes, failures always due to the aphasic condition.

It is to be noted also the poor rote memory . . . may or may not be a symptom of the aphasia."

In July, 1940 (age 7-4), after two years, K. was withdrawn from our school, over the protest of the clinician, as the parents wanted her to go to school with her twin and be with normal children. She had developed much speech, though her tenses were confused and there was still much mental confusion. Although she was reading second grade material, the clinician advised repeating the first grade work because of the difficulty in number comprehension and to build confidence in herself.

After five months at home, the parents realized their mistake and returned K. to our school. She was entered in the high first grade in a nearby public school, while her speech work and comprehension were carried on in the afternoon. At that time her speech was very good, but there was language confusion in the use of tenses. She read well, wrote nicely, and did good number work under supervision. However, her spontaneous speech still showed language confusion in use of tenses and in recall of material.

After five months (age 8-3), she was again withdrawn against the advice of the clinician. It was difficult to make the parents realize that although K. had developed good speech, she did not have language usage or comprehension necessary to carry on in a normal group situation.

In September she was entered in public school in her home town where she remained one semester. She did not progress and became quite a behavior problem. In January, 1942 (age 8-10), she was entered in a private school. Her academic work showed some improvement in the small group situation.

During the next three years she was at home. Part of the time she attended private school and part of the time public school. She was promoted with her class but as material became more difficult, she did not comprehend and consequently remained at a standstill while her classmates progressed. Her teachers did not understand her problem and how to cope with the aphasic condition. She became more and more a problem. She realized her failures in school and was unable to adjust herself to the whirl of business and social activities which were constantly going on at home. She resorted to temper tantrums and provoking embarrassing scenes in the home, so much so that the parents in 1944 again sought the advice of a psy-

chiatrist. She was taken to a Child Guidance Clinic and given the following tests: Arthur Point Scale Intelligence Test, the Revision of the Binet, and the Wechsler Bellevue. I quote from that report: "Her performance throughout was most uneven and she was unable to concentrate her attention on the task at hand . . . I am positive that this little girl is not feeble-minded or intellectually retarded. She is, of course, retarded in school and she is retarded in her intellectual achievement. Nevertheless, it is our opinion that she has good basic intellectual capacity and that the test results do not offer a reliable rating."

In September, 1944 (age 11-6), she re-entered the Davison School and remained two years. While she had progressed in her physical activities, such as swimming, canoeing, fishing, horseback riding, etc., and her social graces had shown progress, her academic work was at the second grade level which was the same as when she left the school three years before.

During the last two years she was with us, in addition to concentrating on academic work and developing comprehension, K. took dancing and became quite proficient. She covered the third and fourth grade materials during these two years. Verbal problems in arithmetic were quite difficult for her. When she left the school her tenses were still confused and she had never completely comprehended time and distance.

Before leaving the Davison School in June, 1946 (age 13-3), K. was given a Cornell-Coxe performance Scale where she received a mental age of 8-1. On the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, she received a mental age of 7-4 and an I.Q. of 55. On the Goodenough Measurement of Intelligence by Drawing, she received a mental age of 9-6, and an I.Q. of 71. I quote from this report: "These tests would indicate that her performance ability is well above her verbal ability. Her difficulty seemed to be on the comprehension level — she experienced difficulty in seeing relationships in both verbal and performance items."

The summer after leaving our school, her father bought horses for the twins and entered them in horse shows all over the Southeast. They were both good horsewomen and won trophies and ribbons.

During the next two years she was at home laboring over academic work and struggling in the social stream. The old behavior patterns came more and more to the surface and the parents returned to our

school for advice. They were advised to place K. in a special school where she would continue the development of her social graces and physical activities but would not be required to compete on the academic level. She is happily located in such a school now and is developing physical skills in various handwork. A letter from that school recently states, "Recent achievement tests indicate a 4.5 grade level of achievement, which is constant in reading, arithmetic and language. In her oral work she is unable to answer relatively simple questions. . . . Her ideas appear rather scattered and she has difficulty in concentration. Intellectually our most recent examinations reveal her to have a deficient level of intelligence as measured by the Wechsler-Bellevue examination.. This gives an approximate verbal M. A. of 8 and a non-verbal M.A. of $9\frac{1}{2}$."

You can see from the foregoing that K. has been given a multitude of tests by various people and the scores are extremely varied, ranging from I.Q. of 47 to I. Q. of 78. It appears that the various clinicians are of the general opinion the performance tests were much higher than the verbal. An emotional factor seems to run throughout the tests.

A recent letter from K., written without aid, was very well done but contained three errors of construction: the preposition "to" omitted; the word "very" substituted for "every"; and a confused use of the verb "like."

It is my opinion that had the child been placed in a school and left with an unbroken training period of five or six years, she would have progressed as well as the other three cases that follow.

CASE 2. J.

J. was born July 17, 1935. The family history is negative. Little is known of her birth history as her mother died when she was four years old. She was slow in learning to walk and talk. She was a clumsy child. She had measles at 6 years, mumps and chicken pox at 8 years. She is right handed.

She had been diagnosed as a deaf or hard-of-hearing child. She was in public school three years, passed along with her age group to the fourth grade. However, when she reached this level she was transferred to another school with the recommendation that she be placed in a special class as she was deaf, a behavior problem, and had low mentality.

J. entered the Davison School of Speech Correction November, 1944, at the age of 9 years. Her speech was unintelligible. She had no sibilants or fricatives and many letter substitutions. She could not express herself in sentences. Although she had been passed to the fourth grade, her reading ability was only high first and she understood very little of what she read. She did not respond to her name and gave every evidence of a severe hearing loss.

After working with J. a few days, the clinician found that the difficulty was more a lack of comprehension than hearing. She understood very little until it was dramatized, then she got it quite quickly. Our diagnosis was predominantly receptive aphasia or word deafness (partial sensory aphasia).

After two months she could interpret material she had learned with her back to the clinician. She could even execute a whispered command if it was one she had been taught. Whenever she made mistakes, she was discouraged and would say, "I can't learn."

J. was started on pre-primer material to build comprehension. After thirty-two months of training, covering three and a half years, J. was placed in the third grade of public school in April, 1948. Her achievement was above this level, but it was felt that she should be well advanced over the class in which she was placed in order to build her ego, to give her a feeling of superiority and security, and a chance of leadership she had not had before.

J. adjusted well to the group and was anxious to take part in all activities. She was promoted to the fourth grade in June. The following year she was put in a combination room of fifth and sixth grades, and she continues to do good work.

I would like to give here a summary of her intelligence and achievement tests.

In September, 1946, on the Ontario School Ability Examination, J.'s C. A. was 11-3, her M. A. 7-4, and her I.Q. 65. In October, 1946, she was given the Revised Stanford Binet and earned a mental age of 7-2 and I.Q. of 63. On the Goodenough Intelligence Test in March, 1947, her C.A. was 11-7, her M.A. 10-9 and her I.Q. 92. In February, 1950, J. was retested on the Stanford Binet, at which time her C.A. was 14-7, her M.A. 10-10, and her I.Q. 77.

On re-testing J. with the Stanford Binet, it was found that her score had shown an increase of 14 points, which we feel is a truer picture of her capabilities, especially since her score on the Good-

enough test, which involved no language, was within normal range. It is not assumed that J.'s intelligence increased as a result of her training, but we point out that it is difficult to obtain an accurate score on standardized intelligence tests, due to the inconsistencies in responses of aphasic children.

In November, 1947, J. was given the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary Reading, Form D. In paragraph meaning, her grade equivalent was 2.9; in word meaning, 3.2; and in average reading, 3.1. When she was given the same test in February, 1950, she showed a grade equivalent of 4.6 in paragraph meaning, 5.5 in word meaning, and 5.0 in average reading. On the Stanford Achievement Intermediate Arithmetic test, given in February, 1950, she rated a grade equivalent of 6.6 in reasoning, 6.2 in computation, and 6.4 in average arithmetic. In level of reading, J. progressed from grade 3.1 to grade 5.0. This means a gain of 1.9 grades in 2.25 years. On the basis of these tests, she is learning at the rate of 84%, which is faster than would be expected, since her general rate of learning on the Binet is 77%.

Although J. is only in the 5th grade now, her average arithmetic score is grade 6.4. We have no previous tests to use for comparison, but arithmetic is now her favorite subject, rather than the one most disliked.

CASE 3. D.

D. was born July 24, 1937. Her family history is negative. She was a seven months baby. Labor was prolonged five days. She was blue at birth and had convulsions on the fifth day. She is an only child. She sat alone at 7 or 8 months, and walked at 18 months. She had measles at 1 year and whooping cough at 3 years.

D. entered the Davison School of Speech Correction May 1, 1943, at the age of 5 years 9 months. She had unintelligible jabber and a few scattered words, but she was confused as to their meaning; for instance, when asked for a plate, she gave a doll; a train, she gave a cakepan; a shovel, she gave a saw; a plate, she gave a spoon.

She was temperamental, stubborn, affectionate, energetic, selfish, spoiled and never still a moment. She had been diagnosed as feeble minded and deaf. However, after being taught the meaning of commands, such as bow, walk, run, clap your hands, etc., she could

execute them with her back to the clinician. Therefore, we felt justified in assuming that her hearing loss was not entirely responsible for her speech retardation. Our diagnosis was predominantly receptive aphasia.

In rhythm class she could not follow a pattern from imitation but after being shown what was expected of her, she did quite well.

At first D.'s progress was very slow in learning commands and speech elements. However, after this short slow period, she began to get the idea and her progress was accelerated. Her number work was begun four months after entrance. She was slow in learning this concept. She got recognition of quantities very quickly but was slow with combinations. She learned the tables from memory very easily but had difficulty using them in actual work. Division was slow and difficult. She had difficulty interpreting and following printed directions. The mechanics of arithmetic were much easier for her than verbal problems. She could grasp the concrete, but the abstract she found very difficult.

She learned colors quickly. Prepositions were not difficult from her pictures and books, but the transfer to usage in spontaneous speech was slow. In writing stories, there was a confusion of tenses. Her written work was not neat and very often she had to copy it before it was acceptable to her teacher.

D. took dancing, became quite proficient, and participated in a number of recitals with normal children.

She was given the following tests. Stanford-Binet (L) in September, 1946, C. A. 9-2, M. A. 7, and I.Q. 76. Goodenough Drawing, July, 1947, C. A. 10, M. A. 10, and I. Q. 100.

Her score on the Stanford-Binet is considerably lower than that on the Goodenough Drawing Test. It is felt that lack of comprehension and failure to understand directions on the Binet were responsible for the wide discrepancy. Since her range on the Binet was so short and the items failed were those involving language, the Goodenough Test seems to be a more accurate score of her capabilities.

D. was also given the Stanford Achievement Test in November, 1947, Primary Reading, Form D. Her grade equivalent on paragraph meaning was 3.1 while her age equivalent was 8-1; and on word meaning, the grade was 3.3 and the age equivalent 8-4. On the Durrell-Sullivan Achievement Test, given at the same time (age

10 years 4 months), D. earned a grade equivalent of 3.9 on wording meaning, 4.1 on paragraph meaning, and 5.9 on spelling. Her age equivalent on these items was 9-3.

On the basis of the scores of these tests, it was recommended that D. enter 4th grade in a private school in her home town. She was dismissed from our school on April 1, 1948, after 4 years and 11 months of training. She entered the 4th grade. Here she made a good adjustment and was promoted to the 5th grade the following year. She continues to do satisfactory work and it is not anticipated that she will have any further difficulty with her academic progress.

CASE 4. B.

This is a case of multiple handicaps. This child was born May 13, 1937. Her medical history and diagnosis was given to us as follows: "She was an eight months baby, a breech delivery, and a blue baby. She has a congenital heart disease suggesting the probability of a tetralogy of Fallot. She has deformed hands and feet; a marked mystagmus, and convergent strabismus; a coloboma of the iris and choroid of the right eye. She has only 40% vision in the right eye. Her teeth and tonsils are bad. Partial congenital deafness and mental retardation. No speech."

The family history is negative. There are three younger siblings, all normal.

In April, 1943, she entered the Davison School at the age of six years. Although she entered as a deaf child, the clinician diagnosed her as a predominantly receptive aphasic. She had recognition of 16 nouns which her mother had taught her by showing pictures in a magazine. She could make feeble attempts at saying seven of these nouns.

Her lips and nails were blue. She was unable to run, or to go upstairs without loss of breath. She could participate in only a few easy exercises without acceleration of the heart. She was finicky about her eating, and her mother reported she would not drink milk.

B. was very silly and self-conscious in social situations, often covering her embarrassment with idiotic laughs and negativistic behavior.

After the first month she learned the speech elements very rapidly and her initial progress was rapid. However, she required repeated

contacts with new principles before they became fixed. Her work was constantly interrupted by periods of negativism and behavior which lasted for weeks. Then she would suddenly "snap out of it" and have a period of very good work. She did not like to repeat work for the sake of understanding it. She resisted any new idea and was afraid of it, but once the concept was established, she would use it consistently and well.

In 1946, she showed a mental retardation of 2 years and 7 months on the Ontario School Ability Test. In August, 1948, on the Nebraska test of learning aptitude, she earned a score of learning ability 11 years 6 months, while her chronological age was 11 years 2 months.

Intelligence tests have been administered to her as follows:

| Test | Date | C.A. | M.A. | Results |
|------------------------------------|---------|------|------|---------|
| Ontario School Ability Examination | 9/16/46 | 9-5 | 6-8 | 71 |
| Goodenough | 7/30/47 | 10-3 | 6-9 | 66 |
| Nebraska Test of Learning Ability | 1/14/48 | 10-8 | 11-6 | 108 |

Testing was extremely difficult with this subject to obtain a valid score, because of the visual, auditory and aphasic factors entering in, as well as lowered vitality. It is the belief of the writer that the results of the Nebraska Test are the most accurate indication of her ability.

At the time of her dismissal, she wrote nicely both manuscript and cursive writing. She was reading well at the fourth grade level and doing good work in numbers. Her physical condition had improved tremendously. Her appetite had improved and she drank a quart of milk daily. She walked as far as $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles without undue heart acceleration. She took dancing lessons and had a nice sense of rhythm. She had developed social graces, a good sense of humor, and a wonderful personality which went far toward making one forget her multiple handicaps.

In September, 1948, B. entered the fourth grade in public school. She was promoted with her class and has made the honor roll several times.

The last three cases are able to express themselves quite fluently in both oral and written language. There is an occasional indication, however, of the residual of aphasia. I have received letters from these children recently and would like to quote from them. In most cases the letters are well written as to composition, paragraphing,

capitalization and punctuation. However, in one letter there was this rather typical error, "My teacher had took us to the Fernbank last Friday"; in another, "I have not heard from Dale last week"; another, "In health we are studying about foods and keep flies out of the house and learn to like to eat vegetables"; in another, "My mother have been practicing to learn to drive the car"; and in another, "We are in our geograph about Austria and Hungary this year."

SUMMARY

It can be seen from the foregoing that these four children presented similar clinical pictures. One had no hearing dysfunction, the others had a minor hearing loss that had been considered their major problem. Since speech had meant nothing to these children and since they had no comprehension, they had long since ceased to listen to speech and had, for the most part, conditioned themselves against speech. Hearing aids were used with cases 2, 3, and 4. Their responses were no better with the hearing aid since they lacked comprehension, but the aids did make them more conscious of sound and consequently helped them to learn to listen. Also, when they entered public school, they all discarded their hearing aids and are doing satisfactory work.

The abilities of these four children were about the same and their tests range somewhat parallel. The one case that was in and out of the school, and moved back and forth from a private to a public school, showed academic progress while she was in training but did not make a satisfactory adjustment in home and school. However, there was some compensation in the social situation. The three children who carried out an uninterrupted program of training have made satisfactory adjustments in school, home, and social situations.

THEATRICAL ENTERTAINMENT IN PENSACOLA, FLORIDA: 1882-1892

RUSSELL E. BAGLEY*

The dramatic performances of early Florida took place within the period of twenty-five years from 1821-1845. Among the towns in which theatrical activities found favor were Pensacola, Apalachicola, Tallahassee, St. Augustine, and Tampa Bay. Occasionally a company would visit Key West, but generally Tampa was the stopping place for players going from New Orleans to the West Indies, or to the eastern ports of the United States, and also for those making the trip in the opposite direction on their way to New Orleans.¹ Because of its geographical location, Pensacola became one of the leading theater centers of Florida in the nineteenth century, and consequently was destined to play a major role in the regional theater history of Florida and the South.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Even in the legendary Indian origin of its name — "City of Sor-row" — Pensacola seemed to be linked with one of the symbols of the theater — tragedy. As for its history, Pensacola affords as dramatic a story as any performed in its theaters.

The first two explorers to see what is now Pensacola were Miruela and De Narvaez. In 1516 Miruela sailed into Pensacola Bay, twenty-four years after Columbus had discovered America. Panfilo De Narvaez, also a Spanish explorer, discovered Pensacola Bay in 1528, landed on Santa Rosa Island, and after a brief stay, weighed anchor and sailed away.²

Concerning the checkered history of Pensacola, J.E.D. Yonge states:

*Instructor in Speech, University of Florida.

¹William G. Dodd, "Theatrical Entertainment in Early Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XXV (October, 1946), 173.

²J. E. D. Yonge, "Historic Pensacola," *Pensacola Journal, Special Panama Edition*, 1905-1906.

Thirteen times it passed from the hands of one government into those of another, and the flags of five nations waved over its forts. Seven times it was attacked by land or by sea and each time it was captured. The town has occupied four different sites on the bay shore; twice it was totally destroyed, once by fire and again by a flood, and once it was abandoned for a hundred and fifty years. On two occasions, after a change of government, the town was entirely deserted by its inhabitants.³

Don Tristan De Luna established the first settlement in 1559. This settlement was abandoned following a series of fruitless explorations inland and a hurricane in 1562. De Luna's settlement was made four years before St. Augustine was established and on that fact Pensacola bases her claim to being the oldest city in the United States.

The next Spanish attempt to gain a foothold was about 135 years later, when Andres d'Arriola established a settlement in 1698. When news of the war between Spain and France became known in 1719, the French colony at Mobile under Iberville mobilized an expeditionary force and took Pensacola from the Spanish. Later, in the Treaty of Paris in 1763, at the close of the French and Indian War, Pensacola was ceded to the English. This event marked the beginning of her real growth and progress. The town was surveyed, and the plan of Pensacola as it is today was laid out.

After Spain became an ally of France against Great Britain in 1779, a Spanish expeditionary force under Bernardo de Galvez, Governor of Spanish Louisiana, captured Pensacola from the English in 1781.

So weak was the Spanish government at Pensacola that during the War of 1812 the British openly used the town as a base in inciting the Indians against the United States.⁴ General Andrew Jackson, to prevent this, drove the British out and left the town to the Spanish. Four years later, during the Seminole War, Jackson, believing that the Indians were being stirred up by the Spanish authorities at Pensacola, again attacked the town and captured it.

Fourteen months afterwards the territory was returned to Spain.

³*Ibid.*

⁴*Ibid.*

but two years later, in 1821, Florida was ceded to the United States.⁵ Immediately Pensacola became a potential theater center.⁶ It had much to offer a theater director in this early period: there was sufficient patronage; it was a growing boom town as a result of information circulated that fortunes could be gained there in two or three years; it had a fine bay and unrivaled harbor; and was a beautiful site for a city.⁷ In short, it was represented as being the "El Dorado" of the United States.

THEATER BUILDING

The first theater performance of which there is any record was produced under the management of Andrew J. Allen. The playhouse was called "The Jacksonian Commonwealth Theater," and was opened on the evening of July 17, 1821. No record has been found concerning the physical proportions, design, equipment or capacity of this first of many so-called theater buildings.

The fact that the proprietor in the summer of 1822 was a certain Mr. Cazenave gives a clue to its location, since in 1805 D. Juan Cazenave, along with various partners, had opened and operated a ballroom and place of general entertainment called the "Tivoli." This was located on the southside of Tivoli, now East Zarragassa Street, on a site opposite the rear of the former Episcopal church.⁸ It is probable that in 1821 Cazenave fitted up the "Tivoli" for dramatic entertainments and rechristened it in honor of "Old Hickory" who had been a patron during the Seminole campaign.

After the Jacksonian Commonwealth Theater had "expired," only

⁵Actors did not relish the idea of playing in Florida because of serious trouble experienced during the Seminole War. William C. Forbes and his company, while *en route* to St. Augustine, were attacked by Indians. Most of the actors escaped but two were captured and butchered. The theatrical wardrobe was donned by the Indians who paraded at a safe distance from the Fort as Romans, Highlanders, and Shakespearean heroes. Later some of the Indians taken captive, were found to be decked in the costumes of Othello, Hamlet, and a host of others. Joseph Jefferson, *The Autobiography of Joseph Jefferson* (New York, 1890), 60.

⁶Dodd, "Theatrical Entertainment in Early Florida," *loc. cit.*, 125.

⁷N. M. Ludlow, *Dramatic Life As I Found It* (St. Louis, 1880), 195-200.

⁸Dodd, "Theatrical Entertainment in Early Florida," *loc. cit.*, 153.

various makeshift places were available for theater presentations, such as the dining rooms of the larger hotels.

In the 1860's John Templeton arrived from Cuba in a schooner, bringing with him the remnants of a stranded troupe. Landing in Pensacola he decided to "start again" and finding no available building to be used as a theater decided upon the "Coffee Warehouse" as the logical place. With minor adjustments this building was soon converted into a theater.⁹

A few years later "Uncle Danny" Brent, with the desire to give Pensacola a place of amusement, singled out the old cotton compress that stood at the southeast corner of Gregory and Tarragona Streets as a possible building for the theater. This was a brick warehouse on a railroad siding.¹⁰

It was at this time that Alexander Stoddart, one of Pensacola's wealthy and influential citizens, had brought from New York, Theodore Weber, a well-known artist, to decorate his new mansion on East Hill. Weber's presence gave "Uncle Danny" the opportunity to secure his services to decorate and paint scenery for the old compress, which was dedicated as the "Tarragona Theater."¹¹

After the Tarragona Theater was torn down, performances were held at intermittent times at the Old Yniestra Building and at Germania Hall.¹² In the latter part of 1882, D. F. Sullivan had plans drawn for the erection of an Opera House.¹³

During the period 1882-1892 the managers of the Opera House carried an advertisement in the city directory which stated that the Opera House "possessed fifteen sets of scenery, four footlights, four boxes, seated 1,400 persons, and could be rented for one hundred dollars a night."¹⁴

The theater activity prior to this period was of a sporadic nature and took place in so-called theater buildings. With the opening of

⁹Sidney P. Levy, "The Theater of Yesterday," *Pensacola Journal*, March 25, 1929.

¹⁰Personal interview with Julien C. Yonge, Librarian, P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History, University of Florida, Gainesville.

¹¹Levy, "The Theater of Yesterday," *loc. cit.*

¹²*Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial*, December 8, 1882.

¹³*Ibid.*, December 29, 1882.

¹⁴Wanton S. Webb, *Webb's Pensacola Directory, 1885-1886* (New York, 1885), 159.

the Opera House there was a noticeable increase in the amount of theater activity. The Opera House afforded a fitting and proper place for theater presentations and it became the theatrical center of Pensacola during the years 1882 through 1892.

DRAMATIC ENTERTAINMENT

Charlotte Thompson's troupe presented the first theatrical performance in 1883 at the Opera House.¹⁵ A new dramatization of Charlotte Bronte's novel, entitled the *New Jane Eyre*, was given on January 12, followed by a matinee performance of *East Lynne*, and an evening performance of *Silk or Cotton* on January 13. There were no reports by the press concerning the performance, but one may assume that they were acceptable because Miss Thompson's troupe was booked for another engagement later in the year.¹⁶

On January 20 and 21, William J. Scanlan, an Irish comedian under the management of W. H. Powers, was presented in *Friend and Foe*. The publicity for this performance included the following notice:

The greatest success of 1882-83. The largest theater in America packed to the doors every performance, entire press unanimous in declaring this the greatest success on record, the talented Irish comedian, William J. Scanlan, in Bartley Campbell's latest success, *Friend and Foe*, under the management of W. H. Power. Mr. Scanlan will introduce his latest popular song Peek-a-boo, peek-a-boo, peek-a-boo, also Moonlight at Killarney, Over the Mountains, The Poor Irish Minstrel, I Love Music, Irish Potheen, Mrs. Regan's Party (with dance), etc. Elaborate appointments, new music, grand scenic effects, company unsurpassed . . .¹⁷

On January 19, the *Semi-Weekly Commercial* reported:

NOTICE! Owing to the train being five hours late the SCANLAN COMEDY CO. will not arrive in time to perform

¹⁵Space does not permit all the theater presentations to be mentioned. The writer has endeavored to select for citation those plays and players which he considers the most significant and the most representative of the period.

¹⁶Pensacola *Semi-Weekly Commercial*, December 9, 1883.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, January 16, 1883.

this evening. Tickets sold for tonight will be good for tomorrow night, when curtain will rise at 7:45 p.m.

No other performances were given at the Opera House in January, but the manager still kept his theater-going clientele well informed:

Manager Lowden is determined that our amusement loving people shall have no cause of complaint for lack of entertainment. He has engagements with the Whiteley Dramatic Troupe For February 2nd with M^{lle} Rhea for February 6th. He is also negotiating with Professor Cromwell for a series of entertainments.¹⁸

Professor Cromwell did not appear in Pensacola, indicating that Lowden's negotiations were unsuccessful. Theatrical management in that day was a hazardous business with many disappointments.

The Whiteley Dramatic Troupe, featuring Nera Vernon, "a comedienne from California," presented *The Hidden Hand*, on February 2 and 3. This particular show was advertised as possessing "special scenery, a great cotton picking scene and an educated donkey 'Emma.'"¹⁹ Rhea appeared at the Opera House on February 6 in the comedy *An Unequal Match*. This particular show received a great deal of publicity from the local press. The management announced that, "notwithstanding the great expense attending this engagement, prices will be as usual."²⁰ M^{lle} Rhea played to a crowded house, and her rendition of the character "Hester Grazebrook" received round after round of applause.²¹

On February 28th, Annie Pixley was seen in Clay Greene's adaptation of Bret Harte's novel *M'liss*.²² Miss Pixley, billed as "a dramatic sunbeam,"²³ was evidently a favorite of the Pensacola theater-

¹⁸*Ibid.*, January 26, 1883.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, February 2, 1883.

²⁰The usual prices were: parquette and dress circle \$1.00; gallery \$.50; private boxes ((seating 6) \$5.00 and \$10.00.

²¹*Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial*, February 9, 1883.

²²Arthur Hobson Quinn, *A History of the American Drama from the Civil War to the Present Day*, 2 vols. (New York, 1936), II, 111. Bret Harte's own adaptation remained unacted.

²³*Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial*, February 23, 1883.

goers. In her company was Frances Wilson, as the "Judge," one of the most successful of American comedians.

Miss Katie Putnam presented on successive evenings, from April 11-13, *Lena, the Madcap, Fanchon, the Cricket*, and *The Old Curiosity Shop*. The press described her as being "everybody's favorite, her acting true to nature and supported by a good company." The music for her performances was under the direction of Professor Handel, and each lady in attendance received a souvenir program containing a photograph of Miss Putnam.²⁴

A grand Shakespearean event, the first in the period took place on December 4 at the Opera House. Thomas W. Keene, supported by J. Newton Gotthold and a selected company under the management of William R. Hayden, presented *Richard III*. Thomas W. Keene played first the "Duke of Gloucester" and afterward "King Richard," in the same play.²⁵ All presentations of Shakespeare were popular in Pensacola, and *Richard III* was no exception. Keene was greeted by a crowded house, and according to the press a more thoroughly pleased audience was seldom seen.²⁶

Variety was evidently the order of the day and theater-goers were afforded programs of interest to all. Two weeks later two Irish comedians, Dan and Josie Morris Sullivan, presented their new Irish drama written expressly for them and entitled *Shiel Agar*. The performance was not very well attended but received a favorable report in the paper.²⁷

J. H. Haverly's Company presented *The Silver King* on January 2 and 3. The play was written by Henry A. Jones and Henry Herman, and was then in its second year at the Princess Theater in London. The performance was greeted with good houses on both nights, and the Pensacola *Commercial* spoke of it favorably.²⁸

Minnie Madden [Fiske] at the age of 18, under the management of Legrand White, was presented in Augustin Daly's redramatization of Sardou's celebrated play *Frou Frou* on January 21, 1884. Following the performance the critic stated:

²⁴*Ibid.*, April 13, 1883.

²⁵*Ibid.*, December 1, 1883.

²⁶*Ibid.*, December 5, 1883.

²⁷*Ibid.*, December 22, 1883.

²⁸*Ibid.*, January 5, 1884.

Miss Maddern's acting is charming, her costumes elegant and her beauty bewitching. She made a most favorable impression, and should she return, she will no doubt meet with a flattering reception. Her support is not what it should be, but it is fully up to the average with two or three good actors.²⁹

The Madison Square Theater Company presented the dramatic success Steele Mackaye's *Hazel Kirke* on January 25, the first Pensacola performance of the greatest long-run melodrama. The cast included C. W. Couldock, Mrs. E. L. Davenport, Ada Gilman, W. H. Crompton, DeWolf Hopper, W. B. Cahill, Cecile Rush, J. G. Graham, Carrie Wyatt, Harry Davenport, and others. The Opera House was crowded, and the audience was delighted with the play.³⁰

Mr. Fredrick Paulding and Josephine Reiley appeared on March 10 in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and the following night in *Pygmalion and Galatea*. The latter was then being presented in London by Mary Anderson. The *Commercial* reported:

It would be difficult to imagine anything more perfect than Miss Reiley as the "statute" and when she stepped from the pedestal and came forward it seemed as if she were marble miraculously endowed with life and speech, and this illusion continued throughout although she made love in the most natural manner. Mr. Paulding as Pygmalion was true to life, an artist carried into idolatry by the perfection of his own work, and his fearful punishment and consequent remorse were well portrayed.³¹

Mr. Frank Mayo and Rachel McCauley were seen on November 3 in his great New York success *Nordeck*. The matinee performance was *Davy Crockett*. The fact that attendance was not good was attributed to the excitement of the election campaign of 1884 between Cleveland and Blaine.³²

The Private Secretary, the first Madison Square Theater production with which A. M. Palmer was connected, was presented

²⁹*Ibid.*, January 23, 1884.

³⁰*Ibid.*, January 26, 1884.

³¹*Ibid.*, March 12, 1884. Poor attendance at this performance was attributed to the fact that this was the Lenten season.

³²*Ibid.*, November 5, 1884.

by this company at the Pensacola Opera House on November 7.³³ The play seemingly received little publicity and no reviews. Gus Williams,³⁴ a German born comic and a favorite in the New Orleans music halls, starred in *One of the Finest* under the direction of John B. Robb before a large and enthusiastic audience on November 26.³⁵

The last performance of 1884 was given on December 29 by Louis Aldrich and his company. The play was written by Bartley Campbell and was entitled *My Partner*. This play was virile, though somewhat exaggerated study of American characters and, in a rude way of American conditions. This play depended more on theatrical and dramatic effect than it did on fidelity to a realistic environment. The Pensacola performance was witnessed by one of the largest audiences of the season.³⁶

The first play in 1885, entitled *The Galley Slave* by Bartley Campbell, starred Frederick Bryton. The performance took place at the Opera House on January 3. The press described "the acting as fair, the production as tame, and hastened so that the troupe might finish in time to catch the evening train."³⁷

Roland Reed was seen on January 16 in Fred Marsden's new comedy drama *Cheek*, which he had recently played in New York. The play was well received and given repeated rounds of applause. An afterpiece, *The Golden Stairs*, was also enthusiastically received.³⁸

The Silver King was given on February 9, 1885, and starred Frank C. Bangs, who had successfully played it in New York. A "double stage and revolving scenery were used."³⁹ On February 13 Frank Mayo returned in *Nordeck* and played before a small but enthusiastic audience. Madame Janauschek returned to Pensacola after an absence of fourteen years and played in *My Life* on February 21. The audience was "fair sized" and the drama critic of the *Commercial* confessed his inability to properly criticize her acting but compromised by pronouncing her "perfect."⁴⁰

³³*Ibid.*, November 1, 1884.

³⁴He is not to be confused with Fitz Williams of Weber and Fields fame.

³⁵Pensacola *Semi-Weekly Commercial*, November 26, 1884.

³⁶*Ibid.*, December 31, 1884.

³⁷*Ibid.*, January 3, 1885.

³⁸*Ibid.*, January 17, 1885.

³⁹*Ibid.*, February 7, 1885.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, February 25, 1885.

Minnie Maddern returned on March 9, in her new success *Caprice*, and was supported by Henry Miller⁴¹ and the original New York company.⁴² This was her greatest success as an ingenue and she sang the song "In the Gloaming."

A new place of theatrical entertainment, called the Bay View Theater and located on Palafax Wharf, was opened on November 7. The manager, Captain Evans, had just returned from the North "where he had been for the past two months to secure first class entertainers," according to reports in the paper. Very little information may be found concerning this theater, so that the following report must suffice:

The proprietor has been able to secure a first class stock company composed of the best minstrels, dancers, comedians, vocalists, gymnasts, etc. who will amuse their audiences with songs, dances, witty sayings, humorous dialog, [sic] comical situations and many other things too numerous to mention. Each performance to conclude with a Laughable Afterpiece by the entire company. A free balcony serenade every eve at 7:30. All new faces this season. Come one, come all and enjoy yourself at the Bay View Theater, where you can be served with the finest lager beer, good wines and liquors, and the best grands of cigars. Admission — 15, 25, and 35¢. You will be served by polite and attentive waiters who will see that every comfort of the inner man is tended to.⁴³

The Bay View Theater was characteristic of the musical hall type whose entertainment was so popular during this period.

On November 26 Lester and Williams presented Charles Hoyt's *A Parlor Match*, starring Jennie Yeamans, and on November 28 *Me and Ole Hoss*. The attendance was slim and the local critic for the *Commercial* described it as being "not of a character to satisfy an audience that is capable of intelligent criticism."⁴⁴

Frank C. Bangs returned on February 1 in *The Silver King* and played before one of the largest audiences of the season.⁴⁵ On

⁴¹The father of Gilbert Miller, the well-known contemporary New York producer.

⁴²Pensacola *Semi-Weekly Commercial*, March 5, 1885.

⁴³*Ibid.*, November 7, 1885.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, November 28, 1885.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, February 3, 1886.

February 9, Janish⁴⁶ appeared in Sardou's play *Princess Andrea*, but unfortunately a portion of the play was omitted so that the troupe could "catch a 10 o'clock train." Thus, the critic of the *Commercial* summed up the performance as follows:

It is always a little difficult to criticize a play that was given only in part as the rendition of *Princess Andrea* by Janish and Her company last night. The fine audience in attendance, the largest of the season deserved better treatment at the hands of the company, but of course when a troupe must catch a 10 o'clock train much artistic effect must be sacrificed. Janish herself is grand except in her tragic moments she is too stagey and her love making is sickening in its sweetness.⁴⁷

William J. Scanlan again occupied the boards of the Opera House in a new Irish play *Shane-Na-Lawn* on February 11.⁴⁸ A week later the well-known comedian, John T. Raymond, assisted by Kate Forsyth, presented Arthur Wing Pinero's farce-comedy, *The Magistrate*.⁴⁹ On February 22, Oliver Doud Byron and Katie Byron appeared in F. A. Scudemore's comedy drama *Inside Track*.⁵⁰

The Huntley-Gilbert Dramatic Company presented a repertory of plays for two weeks beginning March 22. The amazing scope of the repertory may be noted from the following titles: March 22, *Rosedale*; March 24, *Enoch Arden*; March 25-31, *Esmeraldo, Frou Frou, Streets of New York, Rip Van Winkle, A Celebrated Case*, and *Under the Gaslight*. *Hazel Kirke* was the matinee piece on March 26. The company completed the engagement on April 3 with *The Danites*, Joaquin Miller's drama of California. The *Commercial* reported that they played to good houses all during their engagement.⁵¹

Following the summer hiatus, Edwin Thorne opened the fall season on October 4 in *The Black Flag*, the same play in which he had

⁴⁶It is possible to mistake Janish for Janaushek, a popular ruse of some actors and actresses to capitalize on the ignorance of the people in the hinterlands by adopting a name which could possibly be mistaken for that of a well-known star.

⁴⁷*Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial*, February 10, 1886.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, February 6, 1886.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, February 13, 1886.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, February 17, 1886.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, March 17, 1886.

been a success at the Union Square Theater in New York.⁵² On October 7, Frank C. Bangs, having ended his long rein in *The Silver King*, was presented in the character of "St. Mark" in *Soldier of Fortune*, the part formerly played by the late E. L. Davenport. The audience was very well pleased with the performance but the newspaper reported Bangs support as being only fair.⁵³

On November 3, 1886, the young tragedian, Robert Downing, was presented in Robert M. Bird's *The Gladiator*, written originally for Edwin Forrest. Downing had won high praise from the public in leading support to Joseph Jefferson and Mary Anderson. The "world famous athlete," William Muldoon, appeared with Mr. Downing. Downing was well reported in the *Commercial* but was quoted as being inferior to McCullough in the same part.⁵⁴ The spectacular *The Devil's Auction*, was presented on November 10. The press reported "the ladies of the ballet shapely in form and poetical in motion, and the little acting necessary in the play well executed."⁵⁵ Louise Rial was favorably received in *Fortune's Fool* on December 17 and 18, and was reported to be "the equal of Clara Morris."⁵⁶

The first performance in 1887 presented Daniel E. Bandman, supported by Louise Beaudet, in *Romeo and Juliet* on January 10. It was the intention of the company to play *Richelieu*, but owing to the illness of Violet Black, *Romeo and Juliet* was substituted to the manifested dissatisfaction of the audience.⁵⁷ On January 15, Kate Claxton and Charles A. Stevenson, supported by their own company, were seen in Hart Jackson's adaptation of the melodrama, *The Two Orphans*,⁵⁸ written by D'Ennery and Cameron. The company boasted "special scenery and elegant costumes."⁵⁹ On January 24, James O'Neill presented *Monte Cristo*. The reporter from the *Commercial* said that Mr. O'Neill was worthy of better support, yet the Opera

⁵²*Ibid.*, October 2, 1886.

⁵³*Ibid.*, October 8, 1886.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, November 6, 1886.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, November 13, 1886.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, December 18, 1886.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, January 12, 1887.

⁵⁸The play was first produced on December 21, 1874, by A. M. Palmer at the Union Square Theater in New York. Miss Claxton bought the rights from Palmer and played the piece successfully for twenty years.

⁵⁹*Pensacola Semi-Weekly Commercial*, January 12, 1887.

House was crowded to its fully capacity and the audience received it enthusiastically.⁶⁰

Annie Pixley returned again on February 17 with good support to stage *The Deacon's Daughter*.⁶¹ On February 22, M'lle Rhea in her farewell American tour was seen in *The Widow*.⁶² John T. Raymond appeared on February 24 in Mark Twain's *Colonel Mulberry Sellers*, his most famous role.⁶³

Cora Van Tassel and her dramatic company staged a week's repertory at the Opera House from March 21-26. *The Danites*, *Kathleen Mauverneen*, *Fanchon*, *the Cricket*, *Gyp*, *Hidden Hand*, and *Hazel Kirke* were presented on successive evenings. All the performances were greeted by good houses.⁶⁴

Following the usual summer break, the Opera House opened on November 2-3, when Mabel Sterling and her company presented the musical comedy *Three Corners*.⁶⁵ Cora Van Tassel returned on November 10 in *The Hidden Hand*. The following report appeared in the *Pensacola Daily Journal*:

The six acts were railroaded through like a city ordinance to enable the troupe to leave on the 10:20 train. This haste was much appreciated by the audience who were more interested in the band. The play was characterized by too much swearing. Miss Van Tassel will hardly be as well received on her next visit.⁶⁶

William Gillette's well-known play, *Held by the Enemy*, was presented on December 21 by the original New York cast. The play was still running in New York at the time. It had had a phenomenal run of 350 nights in New York, 100 in Boston, 75 in San Francisco, and 100 in London.⁶⁷ The play, although a Civil War Story, was suitable to be played in the South because of impartiality; however, the sensitivity of the South was apparent as indicated in the review on the following day:

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, January 26, 1887.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, February 12, 1887.

⁶²*Pensacola Daily Commercial*, February 22, 1887.

⁶³*Ibid.*, February 22, 1887.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, March 28, 1887.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, November 1, 1887.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, November 11, 1887.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, December 17, 1887.

The cast was a good one except for Sidney Bowkett who is not suited to the part of Lt. Hayne. He compared unfavorably as a Confederate officer with the officers on the Union side, the part is certainly deserving of a commanding presence, coupled with an air of self-reliance and fortitude, which were wanting in his interpretation.⁶⁸

The comedy, *A Cold Day*, was the first dramatic production in 1888. The piece was presented on January 2, under the management of the writer Perkins D. Fisher. "It is to be regretted that a ham-fat combination of people like those that performed should be greeted by such a fine audience," was the reaction of the press which declared "The performance was a very rotten affair."⁶⁹ On January 18, the well-known actors Louis James and his wife Marie Wainwright, were seen in *Virginius*.⁷⁰ There was a large house for "a deserving play." W. W. Allen and Annie Ward Tiffany gave an "outstanding presentation" in *Shadows of a Great City* on January 19. On January 23-24, Florence Elmore, supported by Oliver Hagan, presented *Lady Clancarty* and *The Hunchback*.⁷¹ The press stated that there was "a fair sized audience," that "Miss Randall was charming and captured the house at once," but that "the rest of the cast were not so happy. Either there were too many comedy parts in the play or too many comedians in the party."⁷² The Madison Square Theater Company presented *Jim, the Penman* on February 9, and according to reports "there was not a poor performer in the company."⁷³

Lester and Allen produced *The Early Bird* at the Opera House on April 6. The show was evidently a disappointment. The newspaper stated:

It was to have been and was expected that a good show would appear last night. It is Pensacola's misfortune that the character of *The Early Birds* was unknown before it was learned by experience.⁷⁴

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, December 22, 1887.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, January 3, 1888.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, January 20, 1888.

⁷¹*The Pensacolian*, January 21, 1888.

⁷²*Ibid.*, January 31, 1888.

⁷³*Ibid.*, February 10, 1888.

⁷⁴*Pensacola Daily Commercial*, April 7, 1888.

It appears that Manager Potter was grossly deceived in giving the Lester and Allen combination a date at the Opera House. They are not *The Early Birds* he thought they were, but have stolen the title and some of the features, investing the latter with the indecency previously noted, from another and respectable company.⁷⁵

The 1888-1889 season opened on October 15-16, when Robert Downing returned in *Spartacus* and *Julius Caesar*. The reporter for the *Commercial* said:

Every actor has his best card, evidently *Spartacus* is Downing's; as *Hamlet* is Booth's; *Reichelieu*, Barrett's; *Virginus*, McCullough's. All roles excellently cast and played.⁷⁶

On December 10, Janaushek returned to the Opera House in a dramatization of Sir Walter Scott's famous novel *Guy Mannering*, entitled *Meg Merrilies*, which had been Charlotte Cushman's great role. The performance merited an interesting report considering the previous criticism of Janaushek's acting:

Poor old Janaushek, unfitted by reason of too plainly an apparent age for the vigorous parts which of yore evoked the applauses of the world, they have at last put you in a part where the tax upon your physical and mental resources is not too great, and in a part that is interpreted nevertheless by Charlotte Cushman, that is all too inadequate to display the tragic greatness commensurate with the skill and talent of bygone days.⁷⁷

Charles McCarthy appeared on March 2, 1889, in *One of the Bravest*. The *Commercial* reported: "It was a good presentation and used one of the local firemen in the fire scene."⁷⁸ Bell's Marionettes filled a week's engagement, March 11-16, presenting *Minstrels* and *Humpty Dumpty*. The house was filled every night and there was standing room only.⁷⁹

The next performance was not until October 23, when the well-known actress Effie Ellsler, supported by Frank Weston, appeared

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, April 9, 1888.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, October 16, 1888.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, December 11, 1888.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, February 27, 1889.

⁷⁹*Pensacola Daily News*, March 17, 1889.

in *The Governess*. The play was not well appreciated because it was rushed through with ill-becoming haste.⁸⁰ *Held by the Enemy* returned on October 31.⁸¹ On November 11, Louis James returned in *Othello*. The reporter stated:

The play was well received by a large audience. An ideal "Othello," such a one in frame, voice and gesture as the immortal bard must have had in mind.⁸²

Daniel Frohman's Lyceum Theater Company presented a play by Belasco and DeMille, entitled *The Wife*, on December 14. Mrs. Berland Gibbs was the leading lady.⁸³ On November 18, Charles A. Gardner was seen in *Fatherland*,⁸⁴ and on November 22 and 23, Augustin Daly's successes, *A Night Off* and *An Arabian Night* were produced.⁸⁵

J. K. Emmett was presented in his own creation, *Uncle Joe*, on January 16, 1890. The news reported that "this was the largest house financially that Pensacola had ever known."⁸⁶ Annie Pixley returned on January 23, to pack the Opera House for a performance of 22, *Second Floor*. On January 29, Mrs. Burnett's world famous play, *Little Lord Fauntleroy*, was staged successfully.⁸⁸ This was an adaptation by Mrs. Burnett of her novel by the same name.⁸⁹

On February 9, *Daniel Boone* was produced at the Opera House,⁹⁰ followed by Arthur Rehan's company on February 10, in *Surprises of Divorce*, which had enjoyed a 105 night run at Daly's theater in New York.⁹¹

Katie Emmett appeared in *Waifs of New York*, "a realistic pic-

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, October 24, 1889.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, October 29, 1889.

⁸²*Ibid.*, November 12, 1889.

⁸³*Ibid.*

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, November 18, 1889.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, November 20, 1889.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, January 17, 1890.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, January 24, 1890.

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, January 30, 1890.

⁸⁹Quinn, *A History of the American Drama from the Civil War to the Present Day*, 208.

⁹⁰*Pensacola Daily News*, January 31, 1890.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, February 7, 1890.

ture of lights and shadows in the great metropolis," on March 7. The reporter for the *Daily News* stated that the play contained "no end of the impossible, but the scenery made it go."⁹²

A. M. Palmer's Madison Square Theater Company, financially in trouble by this time,⁹³ returned on October 7, to present *Jim, the Penman*. The same strong cast performed, but the attendance was rather slim probably because the play had been presented so many times.⁹⁴ *Twelve Temptations* was presented on October 9.⁹⁵ The well-known actress, Lillian Lewis, returned on October 16, to present *Credit Lorraine*.⁹⁶ On October 17, Augustin Daly's *Under the Gaslight*, was performed.⁹⁷

Frank Jones returned in his own creation, *Our Country Cousin*, on December 9, and filled a very successful engagement according to the reporter for the *Daily News*.⁹⁸ On December 11, the Hanlon's presented *Fantasma* to a pleased audience.⁹⁹ The year closed with a "very worthy" performance of Denman Thompson's play, *The Old Homestead*, on December 22.¹⁰⁰

Mr. Henshaw and Miss Broeck gave a "lamentable performance" of *The Nabobs* on January 12, 1891. "Last night's performance," the press said, "was just one degree removed from a beer dive entertainment, coarse, brazen, stale."¹⁰¹ On January 17, Annie Pixley was seen again in *M'liss*.¹⁰² Thomas W. Keene was presented again in *Richard III* on January 19. The *Daily News* reported there was "a large and pleased audience."¹⁰³ On January 26, *Inherited* was performed by Maude Granger and the New York cast.¹⁰⁴

Katie Emmett, another good drawing card with the Pensacola

⁹²*Ibid.*, March 8, 1890.

⁹³Arthur Hornblow, *A History of the Theater in America*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1919), II, 275.

⁹⁴*Pensacola Daily News*, October 3, 1890.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*, October 8, 1890.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, October 13, 1890.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, October 9, 1890.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, December 10, 1890.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, December 12, 1890.

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, December 23, 1890.

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, January 13, 1891.

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, January 15, 1891.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, January 20, 1891.

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, January 27, 1891.

public, returned in *The Waifs of New York* and packed the Opera House on February 12.¹⁰⁵ Louis James, with a strong company, presented *Macbeth*, on February 17. The *Daily News* stated that the audience was large, as was generally the case when a Shakespeare play was performed.¹⁰⁶ On February 23, J. C. Stewart appeared in his own creation, *The Fat Man's Club*, and kept the audience convulsed with laughter all during the performance.¹⁰⁷ The well-known actor, Frank Mayo, appeared in *Davy Crockett* on February 27. The play was billed as "a symphony to the mosses, a new birth to our soil, an idyll of the backwoods."¹⁰⁸

Neill Burgess' company presented *The County Fair* on October 19. This play was enjoyed by the largest audience in the history of the Opera House, every seat having been sold in advance.¹⁰⁹

On November 1, *Hazel Kirke* was again presented in the Opera House to a good-sized audience by an excellent cast including Effie Ellsler, C. W. Couldock, and Frank Weston.¹¹⁰ Lincoln J. Carter's, *The Fast Mail*, was scheduled to be presented on November 6. The train was so late that the performance was not given until November 7.¹¹¹ Lewis Morrison appeared on November 9, as "Mephisto" in a dramatic version of *Faust*. The Opera House was crowded and the audience was enthusiastic in its reception of the performance.¹¹²

The Pay Train, a comedy drama starring Florence Bindley, was produced on December 27, before a good-sized audience. The press gave an indication of the elaborateness of the production:

The scenes of the pay train robbery and at the mines, where the coal car is hauled down the decline were startling in realism; as stage mechanism such skill has never before been surpassed in this city.¹¹³

The well-known Frederick Warde returned to Pensacola to ap-

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*, February 18, 1891.

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, February 19, 1891.

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*, February 24, 1891.

¹⁰⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, October 20, 1891.

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*, November 2, 1891.

¹¹¹*Ibid.*, November 6, 1891.

¹¹²*Ibid.*, November 10, 1891.

¹¹³*Ibid.*, December 11, 1891.

pear in *Damon and Pythias* on December 17. Mr. Warde enjoyed a very large audience for his play.¹¹⁴ On December 19, *Two Old Cronies* was performed by Al H. Wilson, Ada Deaves, and Ed J. Heferman.¹¹⁵ J. C. Stewart appeared again in Pensacola, on December 30, this time in *The Two Johns*.¹¹⁶

On January 1, 1892, the Opera House was occupied by Ray L. Royce in *Tom's Vacation*. *The Charity Ball*, by Belasco and DeMille, was presented in the Opera House on January 5; from the reports in the *Daily News* it was very favorably received by the audience.¹¹⁷ Cora Tanner, in her most successful play, *Will She Divorce Him?* occupied the boards of the Opera House on January 7. According to the press "all members of the cast were well up to the requirements of their parts."¹¹⁸

Robert Downing returned on March 12, to present *Ingomar* in the afternoon and *Virginus* in the evening to a "crowded" Opera House.¹¹⁹ The Huntley Comedy Company filled a week's bill from March 14-19. The plays presented on successive nights were *Dens and Palaces*, *Michael Strogoff*, *The Convict*, *Rip Van Winkle*, and *Uncle Daniel*. The matinee of the 19th was *East Lynne*.¹²⁰ *The City Directory*, which had had long runs in the larger theater centers, was given a successful rendition at the Opera House on March 29.¹²¹

Barney Ferguson appeared on September 16, in his own creation, *McCarthy's Mishaps*, seen first with Charles Rice in 1891. The *Daily News* reported:

From first to last the piece moved with unbroken spirit, and vivacity, the trick piano, the knock-about business, and all the quick touch-and-go trifles such as these were at their best.¹²²

Barney Ferguson in later years became totally deaf from so much head bashing.¹²³

¹¹⁴*Ibid.*, December 17, 1891.

¹¹⁵*Ibid.*, December 28, 1891.

¹¹⁶*Ibid.*, December 31, 1891.

¹¹⁷*Ibid.*, January 6, 1892.

¹¹⁸*Ibid.*, January 8, 1892.

¹¹⁹*Ibid.*, March 13, 1892.

¹²⁰*Ibid.*, March 12, 1892.

¹²¹*Ibid.*, March 30, 1892.

¹²²*Ibid.*, September 17, 1892.

¹²³Douglas Gilbert, *American Vaudeville, Its Life and Times* (New York, 1940), 115.

The A. M. Palmer Stock Company appeared in Augustus Thomas' *Alabama* on November 1. The cast was composed of such well-known actors as J. H. Stoddart, Odell Williams, Jennie Euctiace, etc., and was greeted by a large audience in spite of an advance in the price of tickets.¹²⁴ On November 2, Steele MacKaye's *Paul Kauvar*, directed by Eugene Robinson and starring Porter J. White, was presented in "an excellent manner to a large house."¹²⁵

On November 24, Verona Jarbeau was presented for a third time in *Starlight*. The press reported:

A small house, should have been smaller, the play will never be popular in the South. We hope she will profit by the lesson here and we gladly see her leave.¹²⁶

The Neill Burgess Company returned to present his great play entitled *The County Fair*, the last performance of the period, under Burgess' personal supervision on December 22. Five thoroughbred race horses appeared in the play. The press reported, "an excellent play, an excellent cast."¹²⁷

CONCLUSION

The theater-goers of Pensacola had an opportunity to witness a large number of dramatic performances during the period from 1882-1892. They also had the privilege of attending many musical entertainments.

Approximately 562 entertainments were presented from 1882 through 1892. Of this total, there were 338 dramatic performances, consisting of 216 individual plays; 99 musical entertainments, composed of minstrel and various forms of opera performances; and 125 lyceum and variety entertainments, lectures and miscellaneous.

There was a definite correlation between the erection of the Pensacola Opera House and professional theater entertainment. In 1882, the year preceding its erection, there were four lectures and miscellaneous presentations, one musical production, and four dramatic entertainments, making a total of nine performances. Following the opening of the Opera House in January, 1883, there were

¹²⁴Pensacola *Daily News*, November 2, 1892.

¹²⁵*Ibid.*, November 3, 1892.

¹²⁶*Ibid.*, November 25, 1892.

¹²⁷*Ibid.*, December 23, 1892.

eleven lectures and miscellaneous programs, thirteen musical, and twenty dramatic entertainments, making a total of forty-four performances.

The majority of performances presented in Pensacola were only two seasons removed from Broadway. Many plays presented in New York, played in Pensacola, and then returned to play in New York with the same cast participating. Some plays were actually performed in Pensacola before they played in New York. In a few cases the same cast which played a show in New York appeared in it in Pensacola within a month's time. On the other hand, some shows which appeared in Pensacola were performed a month later on Broadway by the same cast. Of a total of 216 plays presented in Pensacola, 181 made New York appearances. This would seem to indicate that the people of Pensacola had an opportunity to see much of the best that was offered to the populus of the large theatrical center.

The Pensacola theater was evidently typical of that of larger Southern cities. Francis Simkins writes slightlyinglly of the Southern theater as being "a perambulating affair imported from New York City,"¹²⁸ because it was not creative. Nevertheless, it was good theater. The theater activity of Pensacola compares very favorably with that of the larger theatrical centers.

Unfortunately, there were no indications of a regional theater indigenous to the area, and there appeared to be little effort to encourage regional plays or regional playwrights. However, the theater was vigorous and its variety kept the people aware of the importance of theatrical entertainment. Many of the plays produced, such as *The Danites*, *Rip Van Winkle*, *My Partner*, *The Flash Light*, *Alabama*, *Davy Crockett*, *Daniel Boone*, and *The Old Homestead*, were regional in nature. Sidney P. Levy of Pensacola, became interested in the theater while serving as an usher at the Opera House, became an actor in New York under the management of the Frohmans and the Shuberts, and returned later to become the last manager of the Pensacola Opera House.

A large number of well-known actors on the New York scene appeared in Pensacola. Of the 432 actors appearing of which there

¹²⁸Francis Butler Simkins, *The South, Old and New, . . . , 1820-1947* (New York, 1947), 298.

is any record, 310 acted in the theaters of New York. It is to be regretted that newspapers did not always carry complete casts. Some of the better known of this period which appeared in Pensacola were: Daniel E. Bandman, Louise Beaudet, Neill Burgess, Kate Claxton, C. W. Couldock, Harry Davenport, Effie Ellsler, J. Newton Gotthold, DeWolfe Hopper, Louis James, Fanny Janaushek, Thomas Keene, Mrs. Fiske, Frank Mayo, Henry Miller, James O'Neill, Annie Pixley, Katie Putnam, Roland Reed, Hortense Rhea, William J. Scanlan, J. H. Stoddard, Marie Wainwright, Frederick Warde, Jennie Yeamans, John McCullough, John T. Raymond, Cecile Rush, and Francis Wilson. In opera there were: Emma Abbott, Clara Kellogg, Minnie Hauk, and Henrich Conried. In the minstrel field were such outstanding companies as Haverly's, McIntyre and Heath's, Al G. Fields, and Primrose and West's. There is no doubt that the people of Pensacola had an opportunity to see many of the greatest actors and actresses who played in the larger theatrical centers.

Of the 216 individual plays, forty-six were written by American playwrights. This means that more than one-fifth, or about twenty-one per cent of the plays performed, were of American authorship. It will suffice here to mention a few of the American playwrights whose plays were performed in Pensacola. Among them were: Steele MacKay, Charles H. Hoyt, William Gillette, J. Augustin Daly, Augustus Thomas, Bartley Campbell, David Belasco, Cecil B. DeMille, Frances Burnett, Joaquin Miller, Frank Murdock, Bret Harte, and Mark Twain. With the rise of American playwrights the American producer no longer need to look to Europe for play material.

The population of Pensacola during the decade 1882-1892 was approximately ten thousand. Pensacola possessed an Opera House which seated approximately 1,400 persons. This building was on many occasions crowded for performance after performance on successive nights. Assuming that no one individual attended more than once for a given performance, it is evident that a very large percentage of the people of the community must have patronized the theater. This is also indicated by the number and calibre of performances that the management was able to finance. It should be noted, also, that the erection of a building of the size and type of the Pensacola Opera House is indicative of the place the theater played in the cultural life of the community. Moreover, many local organizations, which had as their primary purpose the presentation of thea-

trical entertainment, functioned in Pensacola. When community needs existed, plays, minstrels, and various opera performances were the medium through which funds were raised. Benefit performances were given to raise funds for church buildings, band uniforms, war monuments, and the relief of yellow fever sufferers when the town underwent a plague. The theater was definitely an integral part of the intellectual, social, and cultural life of Pensacola.

A PROCEEDINGS REPORT OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Sessions of the Southern Speech Association (including the Forensic Tournament and the Student Congress of Human Relations), together with the Southern Regional American Educational Theatre Association Conference Workshop, and the Workshop in Speech Correction and Hearing were held during the week of April 3 to 7, 1950. Headquarters were at the Tutwiler Hotel in Birmingham, Alabama. The Forensic Tournament was held on April 3, 4, and 5 and the Student Congress of Human Relations on April 6 and 7. The A.E.T.A. and Speech Correction and Hearing Workshops were held on April 5.

THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THEATRE ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE WORKSHOP

Three regular sessions were held by the A.E.T.A. Workshop. The opening session at ten A. M., April 5, consisted of a discussion panel on "Correlating Educational Theatre with Community Life," Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State University, serving as chairman. As first speaker on the panel, Emmy Lou Patton, Central High School, Jackson, Mississippi, discussed problems of coordination involved in the borrowing of properties and costumes, contacts through the newspapers and radio stations, and relations between school and little theatre groups. Miss Patton also suggested the advisability of a governing board to coordinate the efforts of all theatre groups in a given locality. Fredric Plette, Little Rock Junior College, the second speaker of the panel, stated his view that the school director's job is to bring entertainment to the community as well as to train students. He discussed his plans to have three theatres in his locality: a college theatre, a community theatre, and a children's theatre. George McCalmon, Florida State University, the third speaker, analyzed the theatre in the state university as a servant of the state. In this connection, he recommended encouragement of creative writing projects such as A.E.T.A. manuscript projects, and the dramatizing of religious and patriotic events. The fourth speaker, Leighton M. Ballew, University of Georgia, explained the activities of his play group in terms of state tours, the drama loan library, and children's theatre.

The next session, held at one-forty-five P. M., was a discussion panel on "The Administration and Promotion of Educational Theatre in the Community," under the chairmanship of C. M. Getchell, University of Mississippi. Mrs. N. M. Whitworth, Amarillo High School, the first speaker, stated the principle that the teaching of character and personality in theatre is more important than the presentation of subject matter, and in this connection listed a numbers of "do's and don't's." Mr. Sam Hirsch, University of Miami, then discussed the theatre program at his school, which includes a theatre in the round called The Ring. The third speaker, David Morris, University of North Carolina, emphasized ways of promoting the school theatre program. "Concentrate on the customer," and "advertise honestly," said Mr. Morris.

The last regular A.E.T.A. session, held at three-fifteen P. M., was chairmaned by Bruce Roach, University of Texas, on the subject, "Surveying Contests and Festival Problems." This meeting consisted of a demonstration one-act play, presented by students of Holt High School and directed by Warren C. Bryant, the presentation being followed by three critiques: on directing, by Talbott Pearson, Stage, Inc., New Orleans; on acting, by Marian Gallaway, University of Alabama; and on the technical aspects of production, by Duncan Whiteside, University of Mississippi.

WORKSHOP IN SPEECH CORRECTION AND HEARING

The Workshop in Speech Correction and Hearing consisted of a series of six sessions and a luncheon. The Workshop was conducted by Ollie Backus, assisted by Ruth Coffman and Sandra Loeb, all of the University of Alabama. The first session, at nine A. M., April 5, dealt with goals in group therapy. At ten A. M., a demonstration of group teaching was presented by Sandra Loeb, this being followed by an audience question period. At the luncheon meeting, presided over by Lou Kennedy, Louisiana State University, there were introductions of Fellows and Professional Members of ASHA, and at one-thirty P. M., J. J. Villarreal, University of Texas, addressed the group on the subject, "Projective Tests in Planning Therapy of Stutterers." Afternoon sessions were devoted to further study of procedures and questions of modifying functional organization, and to case reports and instructions for parents.

MEETINGS OF THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

The first general session of the Southern Speech Association Convention was held at nine-thirty A. M., April 6. The general subject was "The Role of Speech in World Affairs," under the chairmanship of Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State University. The first speaker, W. N. Brigrance, Wabash College, discussed the role of speech in a democracy. He reaffirmed the Aristotelian principle (the contradictory claim of Dr. Gallup notwithstanding) that public speaking does influence public opinion. Explaining that the speaker's job has become far more difficult during the past one-hundred-fifty years because he must appeal to the masses, Mr. Brigrance stated that industrial and other leaders must become far more articulate than they now are in order to sway public opinion effectively. He directed attention to two cardinal principles of persuasion: "You cannot oppose something with nothing," and "People must be appealed to in terms of what they want." H. P. Bigler, the second speaker, in discussing speech in industrial affairs, presented the view that in this machine age, both industrial workers and speakers should remember the importance of integrity, of ingenuity, and the spirit of man. J. T. Caldwell, President of Alabama College, as the third speaker, elaborated and illustrated the view presented in Walter Bagehot's *Physics and Politics*, that only through free public discussion can modern society survive and progress. The fourth speaker, H. G. Rahskopf, University of Washington, reaffirmed several principles which should govern speech in education. Among other things, said Mr. Rahskopf, "speech education should be the organizing center of the educational process, for speech in a primary and indispensable part of the process of living." John Temple Graves of the Birmingham Post, as the last speaker, discussed the importance and responsibilities of public speakers in national and international affairs. "Peace, today and in the future, depends," said Mr. Graves, "not upon the United Nations or an Atlantic Pact, but upon a determined, strong, patient, free America." Hence, the staggering responsibility for the teachers of speech in our country.

The first business meeting was held at one P. M., April 6, and Glenn R. Capp, President of the Association, presided. Reports were presented on the Tournament and Congress and by chairmen of the various association committees. Election of officers was held and

several matters of new business were disposed of. Constitutional changes were passed whereby the Editor of the *Southern Speech Journal* and the Executive Secretary shall be elected a year in advance of the time their terms of office begin, and whereby the nominations for these offices shall be made by the Executive Council.

The first sectional meeting on Theatre was held at two P. M., April 6, under the chairmanship of McDonald Held, Furman University. The meeting was divided into two parts, the first on "Decentralization in the Theatre," and the second on "The Arts and the Theatre." Because of the absence of Fred Koch, Jr., University of Miami, his paper on "The Fall of Broadway" was read by the chairman. The paper seemed to contradict its title, however, as Mr. Koch wrote it while in a joyous mood on a bus trip to New York City with a group of students from his university. He wrote of the plays which the group planned to see and emphasized that "There's Life in the Old Gal (Broadway) Yet." Joe Wright, Vanderbilt University, spoke on "The University Theatre and Decentralization." He defined decentralization as meaning "more theatre of superior quality for more people." Answering his question as to the place of the University Theatre in the whole scene, Wright said it existed first for the students and second for the community. An important function is to create interest in playwriting. The University Theatre, through A.E.T.A., should evaluate all touring companies and keep a record available for people who might need the information. We should present worthwhile plays, develop playwrights, interpret the university to the community, and give the students new experiences. "The Community Theatre and Decentralization" was the topic of the paper presented by Jack Neeson, Dock Street Theatre, Charleston. Mr. Neeson emphasized that the community Theatre must have a definite purpose, and, if it is to operate with maximum efficiency, only one person should be in charge. This person should be the director of the group. Speaking on "Aesthetics," Walter Trumbauer of Alabama College, presented the theory that all art has three parts: actuality, form, and spirit. He showed a number of charts on color relationships illustrating his theory of aesthetics.

Another sectional meeting was held at two P. M., April 6, on Public Speaking and Rhetoric, of which Frank B. Davis, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, was chairman. Gregg Phifer, Florida State University, discussed Woodrow Wilson's "Swing Around the Circle,

1919." According to Mr. Phifer, the persuasive power of Wilson, a man with a mission, rested on his high moral idealism and his complete dedication to the cause of the League of Nations. Perhaps his greatest weakness was his failure to recognize that honest disagreements may exist. Wilson's tirades against his opponents weakened the possibility of the League's acceptance. Wesley Wiksell, Louisiana State University, spoke on "Obstacles to Discussion," pointing out that because of excessive individualism, bigotry, and intolerance, discussion is one of the most difficult methods to use or to teach. Ignorance, lack of training, and fear of the discussion technique are among the primary obstacles to its successful use in the classroom. Howard Runkel, Duke University, presented information gained from his research on "Herbert Hoover's Presidential Speeches." Mr. Runkel gave a brief rhetorical analysis based on the one hundred-twenty-five major addresses made by Hoover during his four years in the White House. An extremely reticent, uncommunicative man, Hoover never concealed his distaste for the platform. Although he possessed excellent intellectual equipment, had a passion for facts and prepared laboriously, his lack of goodwill and his cumbrous style were serious handicaps to his effectiveness as a speaker. "Free Speech — Bulwark of Democracy," was discussed by Gifford Blyton, University of Kentucky. His speech was based on three premises: (1) free speech and democracy are inseparable, (2) the inductive process reaches its highest level in an atmosphere of freedom, and (3) there is no freedom apart from obligation and responsibility. Robert B. Capel, Stephen F. Austin State College, presented criticisms and comments concerning the entire sectional program.

The sectional meeting on Radio and Television was held at three-thirty P. M. on April 6, under the chairmanship of Joe C. Wetherby, Duke University. A panel considered the question, "Can We Teach Radio and Television?" George Steele, University of Florida, stated that whether or not the school of radio is able to teach the subject, its job is to provide the student with a setup which will permit him to learn radio. Mr. Steele emphasized that radio classes must get down to fundamentals, that the student must be taught local station methods rather than network procedures, and that training in the complete operation of a station is important. Don F. Blakely, Louisiana State University, held that the task of the school of radio is to give a liberal arts training with a focus on radio as an objective. He be-

lieved, too, that there has been an increase of respect for the liberal arts degree on the part of radio executives. Presenting the station owner's view, Thad Holt, President of Station WAPI, Birmingham, stressed the fact that television is quite different from radio, that young men are particularly desired in television, that there is need for a broad educational background, and that there must be training in the little practical things that stations do not have the time to teach. He also warned of the danger of allowing television to fall into the hands of groups whose sole concern is money-making. John E. Young, University of North Carolina, was the last speaker on the panel. He discussed the setup at his institution, pointing out the necessity of maintaining a limited enrollment in radio, and agreed that a broad liberal arts training should be required of all candidates, with possibly a fifth year for training in the technical skills.

The Interpretation Section, at three-thirty P. M., April 6, was organized around the informal topic, "Let's Exchange Ideas," under the chairmanship of Sara Lowrey, Furman University. Robert Dierlam, University of Florida, discussed the proper planning and procedures of courses in interpretation. The next talk, by Carolyn Vance, University of Georgia, on "Grading, Examinations, Methods of Evaluating Student's work," consisted chiefly of the reading and analysis of comments which had been submitted preceding the convention, by members of the Association, regarding grades, examinations and the evaluating of the work of students being trained in oral interpretation. Frances Gooch, Agnes Scott College, then discussed "Techniques of Interpretation." She described these techniques as they apply to the training both of the body and the voice of the student. She also elaborated her view that oral interpretation is basically a combination of all the forms of speech communication. Zelda Horner Kosh, Arlington, Virginia, pointed out under her topic, "Oral Interpretation in Teacher Education," that virtually no speech training in oral interpretation is now being given children in the public schools, and she suggested methods by which these children could receive such training.

At five P. M., April 6, Frances Gooch, Agnes Scott College, presided at The Reading Hour, which was probably the best attended of the Southern Association's reading hours held to date. Roberta Winters, Agnes Scott College, read T. S. Eliot's "Portrait of a Lady," and George Neeley, Emory University, read "The Love Song of J.

Alfred Prufrock," also by T. S. Eliot. The readers of both these poems prefaced their readings by explanatory and critical remarks about the poetry of T. S. Eliot. As the last feature of the program, Allen Bales, University of Alabama, read "Cheaper by the Dozen," from the book by Gilbreth and Carey.

The second general session was held on Friday, April 7, at nine A. M., under the chairmanship of the third vice-president, Batsell B. Baxter, David Lipscomb College, on the subject, "Improving Speech Training at Its Various Levels." Speaking with reference to the elementary and secondary school levels, Rose B. Johnson, Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, stressed the importance of teaching integrity and honesty in speech, taking pride in a well-done teaching job, and teaching children to examine statements rather than to accept them without thinking. Wayne Eubank, University of New Mexico, stated that there is danger of too much specilization on the college and university level, which may bring with it mere training in technique without the inculcation of principles. While pointing out that the teacher is more important than the method, he offered the following methods of improving instruction: (1) in-service teacher training, (2) weekly staff meetings, (3) determination of individual teaching philosophies with the purpose of determining a departmental philosophy, (4) student outline and project books, (5) use of recording machines and motion pictures, and (6) student conferences. Clarence T. Simon, Northwestern University, traced the history of graduate work in speech. He observed that the prestige of the M. A. today is about equal to that of the B. A. of thirty years ago. He warned that we should resist the temptation to give degrees only because they are popular and in demand. He felt that the value of graduate work is demonstrated by the post-graduate activity of the degree holder. In his discussion of the Fundamentals Course, G. E. Densmore, University of Michigan, described the method of handling this course in his school. In the Fundamentals course, he said, we sell ourselves. He concluded by pointing out that industry is more and more vigorously demanding public speaking of college graduates.

"A Re-evaluation of Our Aims and Needs" was the theme of the third general session, at ten-thirty A. M., April 7, and Betty May Collins, Technical High School, Memphis, was chairman. Norman W. Mattis, University of North Carolina, speaking on the subject

of Rhetoric, stated that we should look to our public speaking classes with several main things in mind: style, delivery and thought. Above all, Mattis said, our students should be in a position to adjust to the times. On Theatre and Interpretation, Delwin B. Dusenbery, University of Florida, pointed out that interpretation and theatre are creative experiences, that we should emphasize the sharing of the experience, and be articulate in the sharing of the experience. We are working to create a more useful and happy adult life and toward the creative development of the whole man. Clark Weaver, University of Florida, emphasized that radio is not only a business but an art. After citing statistical data on radio sets in use, stations in operation and listeners, Mr. Weaver pointed out that television is of key importance in radio today. He maintained that to better train their students, colleges and universities should set up their own radio stations for student practice and operation. With Correction as his base subject, Raymond Van Dusen, University of Miami, listed seven practices which we should observe: acquaint students with the speech correction area, sell speech correction to administrators, raise certification standards in the teaching field, license correctionists, see that correctionists keep abreast of the times, know and obtain new types of equipment, and get teachers who want results.

The second business meeting, presided over by Glenn R. Capp, was held at one P. M., April 7. At this meeting elections to the nominating committee for next year were announced, and Howard Townsend, University of Texas, was chosen Editor-Elect of the *SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL*. The Convention city and dates for the 1951 Convention were announced, and it was also decided that the 1952 Convention city would be Jackson, Mississippi or Atlanta, Georgia.

The sectional meeting on graduate study was held at two P. M., April 7, Dallas C. Dickey serving as chairman, and the general topic being, "A Colloquy on Problems and Methods in Southern Graduate Research." The discussion took the form of a round table, the speakers being Sara Lowrey, Furman University; Giles W. Gray, Louisiana State University; Marian Gallaway, University of Alabama; Howard W. Townsend, University of Texas; Charles M. Getchell, University of Mississippi, and J. Clark Weaver, University of Florida. Dr. Dickey proposed a number of questions on "Problems and Methods in Southern Graduate Research." Some problems

discussed were: the importance of the use of the library in research, the requirement of a thesis for the M. A. degree, the value of work in a cognate field as a Master's requirement, the possibility of requiring one foreign language for the Master's degree, the granting of M. A. degrees by small colleges and teacher's colleges, the kind of person who should direct graduate work, and what should be done with the student who seems to lack promise. A lively discussion followed, with additional comments by Bower Aly, University of Missouri; Karl Wallace, University of Illinois; Clarence T. Simon, University of Illinois; Wayne Eubank, University of New Mexico, and others.

The Speech Correction and Hearing section, with Lou Kennedy, Louisiana State University, as chairman, met at two P. M., April 7. The first speaker, Louise D. Davison, Davison School of Speech Correction, Atlanta, Georgia, presented "A Follow-Up on Four Aphasic Children." The case histories of the four children indicated that all are now making satisfactory progress with the exception of one child, who had retrogressed when training in the speech school was interrupted. Severina E. Nelson, University of Illinois, spoke on "Speech for Cerebral Palsied Children." Aided by Marie Orr Shere, Miss Nelson described and demonstrated the techniques used in the speech clinic at the University of Illinois for handling the cerebral palsied child.

Speech Education was discussed at a sectional meeting held at three-thirty P. M., April 7, under the chairmanship of J. Dale Welsch. The three speakers were Frances M. Bailey, Mississippi State College for Women; Florence Pass, Ensley High School, Birmingham; and Mrs. Joe Windham, Franklin Academy, Columbus, Mississippi. According to Frances Bailey, proper training of speech teachers should be based upon definite requirements facing teachers of speech, and should take account of the fact that many teachers of speech need to teach other courses as well. Florence Pass, in her talk on the high school speech program, emphasized the great complexity of speech activities in the high school, and the insufficient time and equipment given the speech teacher. Don Streeter, Memphis State College, led an audience discussion on this paper. Mrs. Joe Windham pointed out the desirability of starting speech training as early as possible, and stated that, if education is to meet the needs of children, speech must be an integral part of the elementary curriculum.

Three speakers participated in the sectional meeting on Phonetics at three-thirty P. M. on April 7, under the chairmanship of James C. Kelly, University of Mississippi. Gayland L. Draeger, Purdue University, explained the use of the Purdue pitch meter in voice intelligibility research. Unfortunately, the meter which Mr. Draeger had brought with him for demonstration was thrown out of adjustment en route, but he presented a clear explanation of its operation and usefulness. Gilbert Tolhurst, Florida State University, spoke on the use of phonetics in speech correction. Mr. Tolhurst presented a series of challenges relatives to the teaching and application of phonetics. The final talk of the Phonetics section was presented by C. M. Wise, Louisiana State University, on "Speech in the Hawaiian Islands." Following introductory comments on the islands themselves, an explanation of the racial make-up of the population, and a discussion of the correlative foreign language component in the background of the English in the islands, Professor Wise described what is now being done in speech improvement in the public schools and in the University of Hawaii. He pointed out, for instance, that every student entering the University, unless excused by an examining committee composed of speech and non-speech teachers, must take a speech course, and must continue taking speech courses up to four semesters unless excused earlier. "If he is not proficient in English speech by the end of the fourth semester, he is denied further attendance at the University until he can pass the requisite examination in speech. Students in the University preparing to teach are required to take seven semesters of speech." Professor Wise's talk was illustrated by a few slides of people in the schools, and by phonograph records in the Hawaiian language, in pidgin English, in island dialect, and in standard General American speech, which is the type of the best speech in the islands.

Several brief sectional meetings were held at five P. M. on April 7. One of these, on the Fundamentals Course, was conducted as a panel under the chairmanship of Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, participants being Vera A. Paul, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute; G. E. Densmore, University of Michigan; and H. P. Constans, University of Florida. These speakers presented interestingly varied views of what the Fundamentals Course should contain. The sectional meeting on Forensics consisted of a panel on the question of the future of the student congress. Paul D. Brandes,

University of Mississippi, was chairman, and participants were Gifford Blyton, University of Kentucky, and Scotty Nobles, Louisiana College. Six definite suggestions came from the panel: (1) use an expert parliamentarian; (2) have a set of rules applying specifically to the congress; (3) limit the areas to which resolutions apply; (4) have resolutions submitted early; (5) submit a set of study questions in advance of the congress, and (6) set up a more definitive classification of parties.

The sectional meeting on Research in Southern Oratory was also set up as a panel, with H. Hardy Perritt, University of Virginia, as chairman, and the topic being "What Directions Should Research in Southern Oratory Take?" The panel was composed of Joseph H. Mahaffey, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Franklin Shirley, Wake Forest College; Don Streeter, Memphis State College; and Dallas C. Dickey, University of Florida. General agreement was reached that research in Southern oratory is a valid field of inquiry and that graduate students in the South should be encouraged to concentrate on southern speakers and the speaking of particular periods and on particular issues. The desirability of the Southern Speech Association's undertaking sponsorship of a volume or more of studies in Southern public address was favorably discussed.

The sectional meeting arranged to discuss the problems of "Speech for Religious Workers" also met at five P. M., April 7, with Charles A. McGlon as chairman. A panel, composed of Fred J. Barton, Abilene Christian College; Theta P. Hargrove, Howard Payne College; and Aloysius J. Blume, St. Mary's University, discussed the same topics that had been projected for discussion at a meeting on "Problems of Speech in Theological Seminaries" at the national convention in Chicago last December. The panel members agreed that preaching, the main type of religious address, can be taught by precept and by example; that clergymen should receive instruction in informal as well as formal speaking; that the fundamentals of voice and diction, public speaking, and oral interpretation should be the basic elements in speech for preachers; that both Speech and Homiletics, or Preaching, are appropriate titles for departments of instruction in religious address; that the relationship between separate departments of speech and homiletics should be "cordially reciprocal," since the division in most cases seems to be an arbitrary one, and that there should be a more explicit relationship

between classwork and extra-class activities undertaken by students of religious address. Both panel and audience agreed that further inquiry into problems arising in the instruction of religious speakers on the high school, college or university, and graduate school levels should be continued by the S.S.A.

GRADUATE CONFERENCES

Following a practice established at the 1948 Convention, three series of Graduate Conferences were held by representatives of the following schools: Northwestern University, Denver University, University of Florida, University of Missouri, Louisiana State University, University of Michigan, Baylor University, University of Alabama, University of Washington, Wabash College, University of Virginia, University of Tennessee, University of Mississippi, University of New Mexico, and University of Texas.

BANQUETS

Members of various groups attending the Convention met socially at a number of breakfasts, luncheons and banquets. The luncheon for the Workshop in Speech Correction and Hearing was held on April 5, with Lou Kennedy, Louisiana State University, presiding. On the same day the Southern Regional A.E.T.A. Conference Workshop held a luncheon. The banquet of the Forensics Tournament was held on the evening of April 5, master of ceremonies being Batsell B. Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Third Vice-President, S.S.A., in charge of the Forensic Tournament. Greetings from the S.S.A. were presented by Glenn R. Capp, president of S.S.A., and finals in after-dinner speaking were held. On the morning of April 7, members of Alpha Psi Omega attending the Convention met at a breakfast, presided over by E. Turner Stump, Kent State University, and another breakfast was held by Tau Kappa Alpha, for which a program was arranged by Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University. A formal banquet for the entire association was held on the evening of April 7, Glenn R. Capp presiding, and Horace G. Rahskopf, President of S.A.A., presenting an address on "New Trails and Familiar Landmarks."

PLAYS

The Members of the Convention were well entertained by a series of excellent theatre productions. On each evening throughout the convention week the Howard College Players, under the direction of John Newfield, presented *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, at Howard College Auditorium. On the evening of April 5, the Alabama Polytechnic Institute Players presented *Tartuffe*, at the Phillips High School Auditorium, and this performance was followed by a demonstration of portable stage settings by Telfair Peet, Alabama Polytechnic Institute. On the evening of April 6, in connection with a Fun Night dinner at the Hollywood Country Club, the University of Alabama Players staged *Amphytron* 38, under the direction of Marian Gallaway. Members of the Convention were also able to see a professional production of *That Lady* with Katherine Cornell on the evening of April 7.

Aloysius J. Blume
Gifford Blyton
Christine Drake
Geneva Eppes
Jean Lowrey
Charles A. McGlon
J. H. Mahaffey
W. Frederic Plette
Paul L. Soper, Chairman

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION

MINUTES OF THE CONVENTION

The Twentieth Annual Convention of the Southern Speech Association was held in the Tutwiler Hotel, Birmingham, April 5-7, 1950. Sessions of the Executive Council were held on Wednesday at 5 p.m. and 10:30 p.m.; Thursday at 10 p.m. and Friday at 9 p.m. Business meetings of the Association were held on Thursday at 1 p.m. and Friday at 1 p.m.

The important actions taken by the Executive Council and the Association may be summarized as follows:

Reports were received from all officers and special committee chairmen. Capel reported that 13 non-commercial exhibits had been arranged, and recommended that we clarify the purpose of such exhibits at further Conventions. Davis reported that we had arranged for 5 commercial exhibits. Miss Calhoun reported that 3 honor organizations had scheduled special breakfasts or meetings.

Shaver reported that a vigorous membership campaign had been conducted throughout the year and that the North Carolina Speech Association had been reactivated. Miss Collins reported that several articles on speech had been published in educational journals and that several others had been accepted, or were being written for publication. She was requested to carry through on these projects. Baxter reported that a successful Tournament and Congress had been held with students from 27 colleges and 16 high schools participating. He pointed out the difficulty of running the Tournament with divisions scattered in various churches, and emphasized the necessity of a central place adequate for the entire tournament. He felt that the Association should emphasize the educational and experimental aspects of this Tournament and listed various procedures which could be followed in the next Tournament.

Dickey reported for the JOURNAL stating that three issues had been published and that copy for the fourth had already gone to the printers. He said he had a number of good articles on hand for future issues, but needed articles particularly in correction and in

theatre. He urged persons interested in those areas to write articles or to suggest others who would do so.

Johnson gave his report as Executive Secretary and as Advertising Manager. The gain in membership of the Association had been 35.3% during the year. In addition a total of 72 undergraduate memberships or subscriptions had been received. The Association was in sound financial condition and the cash assets showed a gain of approximately \$400 for the year. He presented a budget which was adopted. (See below) A total of 47 pages of advertising had been carried in the first three issues of the JOURNAL, producing a net income of \$616.00. The print order for the March issues was for 1,000 copies, with more than that number needed for the May issue.

The Executive Secretary recommended that the Association purchase a steel case visible index system in which to keep the membership and subscription records, estimated to cost \$300. (This recommendation was adopted but the purchase was to be deferred until late in the Summer and to be made only if the resources of the Association justified it.) A recommendation that the Association consider providing the Executive Secretary with additional clerical help above that provided by the school where he is located was discussed and deferred for further study. His recommendation that the Association elect the Editor and Executive Secretary a year in advance was approved and the Constitution so amended. (See below)

The A.E.T.A. Workshop Committee (Roach, Held, Galloway) reported a very fine Workshop with approximately 60 in attendance. The Workshop was held on Wednesday with discussions during the day and a production of *Tartuffe* by the Auburn Players under the direction of Telfair Peet presented in-the-round Wednesday evening.

Miss Kennedy reported for the A.S.H.A. Short Course-Workshop committee (Hale, Chairman, Kennedy, Johnson). This had also been scheduled on Wednesday and was conducted by Dr. Ollie Backus, University of Alabama, assisted by Ruth Coffman and Sandra Loeb. Dr. J. J. Villarreal, University of Texas, had been the luncheon speaker and approximately 75 had been in attendance.

It was agreed that both the A.E.T.A. and A.S.H.A. Workshops would be held on Saturday at the Convention next year.

Miss Lowrey reported for the Nominating Committee. The following officers were nominated and elected:

President—Claude L. Shaver
First Vice-President—Betty May Collins
Second Vice-President—J. Dale Welsch
Third Vice-President—Batsell B. Baxter

The new Nominating Committee was elected at the first business meeting of the Association and Miss West, Chairman of the Tellers, reported the Committee to be as follows: Constans (Chairman), Getchell, Braden, Johnson, Soper.

The Constitution was amended to provide for the election of the Editor and Executive Secretary one year in advance of taking office through the adoption of the following amendments:

Amendments to the By-Laws recommended by the Executive Council to the Association:

To Amend Article I of the By-Laws as follows:

"In Section I, to strike out the word 'Officers' and insert the words 'President and Vice-Presidents' "

"Section 3. The Editor and Executive Secretary shall be elected one year prior to their taking office. These officers-elect shall be nominated by the Executive Council, upon the recommendation of a sub-committee appointed by the President, and elected by the Association at the final business meeting of a Convention."

President Capp appointed a special sub-committee of the Executive Council composed of Perritt (Chairman), Johnson, Getchell, Dickey and Davis to make recommendations for Editor-Elect. The committee recommended Howard Townsend of the University of Texas, who was nominated by the Executive Council and elected by the Association.

Constans reported for the Committee on Time and Place for the 1952 Convention recommending Jackson, Mississippi as first choice and Atlanta as second choice. The report was adopted and the Executive Secretary authorized to explore the possibility of meeting in Jackson or Atlanta in that order and to reach a decision in consultation with the Advisory Committee; but if satisfactory arrangements cannot be made, other possibilities are to be explored by the Executive Secretary and a decision made by the Executive Council.

Shaver outlined tentative plans for the program for 1951 Convention and asked for suggestions. It was agreed to have only one dinner to be called the "Convention Dinner" with dress optional. Constans reported that the Convention Sessions would be held in the Thomas Hotel with the Tournament and Congress on the University of Florida campus. He stated that various facilities of the University would be available to the Association during its Convention which is scheduled for the first week in April.

The Association adopted a motion by Miss Lowrey that we accept the grant-in-aid from the University of Florida for the publication of the JOURNAL and that we express our appreciation to the Library Committee for its action.

The report of the Resolution Committee presented by Weatherby, Chairman, was adopted by the Association.

Miss Dunham of the University of Alabama, appeared before the Executive Council and requested affiliation of the Southern Region of the American Forensic Association with the Southern Speech Association. The matter was discussed by the members of the Council, but final action regarding affiliation was postponed until the next Convention.

The Executive Council elected Joe Wetherby of Duke, as a member of the Advisory Committee. The A.E.T.A. Workshop Committee recommended the election of Franklin Shirley of Wake Forest, as the third member of that committee, and the A.S.H.A. Workshop Committee recommended J. J. Villarreal of Texas, as its third member. Both nominations were approved by the Council.

The Executive Council approved a recommendation by the Executive Secretary that memberships paid at the Waco Convention and those which are usually paid at Convention time be set up to expire at future Conventions despite the change in publication dates of the SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL.

Shaver raised the question of graduate conferences as a part of the Convention program for next year. The Executive Council approved a motion by Held that the matter be left up to the President with power to act.

The Executive Secretary recommended that Council meetings begin early Wednesday afternoon and that no Council meeting be held Thursday night if possible. The Council approved the recommendations and the President was authorized to schedule Council

meeting accordingly.

The new officers of the Association were installed at the final meetings accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,
T. Earle Johnson,
Executive Secretary

ATTENDANCE AT 1950 CONVENTION SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Sustaining | 75 |
| Regular | 107 |
| Students | 3 |
| Non-Members | 48 |
| Non-Students | 25 |
| Total | 258 |

ATTENDANCE BY STATES

| | | | |
|-------------------|----|----------------------|-----|
| Alabama | 92 | Missouri | 1 |
| Arkansas | 4 | New Mexico | 1 |
| Connecticut | 1 | North Carolina | 7 |
| Florida | 28 | Ohio | 1 |
| Georgia | 14 | South Carolina | 4 |
| Illinois | 3 | Tennessee | 26 |
| Indiana | 2 | Texas | 17 |
| Kentucky | 11 | Virginia | 2 |
| Louisiana | 21 | Washington | 1 |
| Michigan | 1 | West Virginia | 1 |
| Mississippi | 20 | | 258 |

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION PROPOSED BUDGET For the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1951

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|--------|------------|
| Income: | | | |
| Convention | | | |
| Fees | | \$ | 200.00 |
| Tournament | | | 450.00 |
| Exhibits | | | 100.00 |
| Dues and Subscriptions | | | |
| 140 Sustaining | @ | 5.00 | 700.00 |
| 450 Regular | @ | 2.00 | 900.00 |
| 100 Library | @ | 1.60 | 160.00 |
| 140 Student | @ | 1.00 | 140.00 |
| Advertising | | | 800.00 |
| Grant from Florida | | | 700.00 |
| Total Income | | | \$4,150.00 |
| Expenditures: | | | |
| JOURNAL | | | |
| 4 issues | @ | 650.00 | 2,600.00 |
| Convention | | | |
| Programs, etc | | | 200.00 |
| Workshops | | | 100.00 |
| Tournament | | | 150.00 |
| Officers | | | 100.00 |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Printing | 250.00 | |
| Executive Secretary's Office | 300.00 | |
| Office Equipment | 300.00 | |
| Reserve | 150.00 | |
| Total expenditures | | \$4,150.00 |

Submitted to the Southern Speech Association, April 7, 1950.

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

STATEMENT OF CONDITION

As of July 10, 1950

ASSETS:

| | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------|
| Bond, First Federal Loan and Savings | \$ 100.00 | |
| Association, Tuscaloosa, Alabama | | |
| Cash, Reconciled Balance, City National | 1,955.54 | |
| Bank, Tuscaloosa, Alabama | | |
| Cash, On Hand | 57.00 | |
| Accounts Receivable: Advertising, May, 1950 | 20.00 | |
| Sales & Subscriptions | 43.31 | |
| Total Assets | | <u>\$2,175.85</u> |

Summary of Cash Receipts and Disbursements For the Period April 1, 1950, through July 10, 1950

RECEIPTS:

| | | |
|--|----------|-------------------|
| Balance in Bank, April 1, 1950 | 1,058.73 | |
| Memberships, Regular and Sustaining | 573.80 | |
| Dues Collected for other Organizations | 2.00 | |
| Grant, University of Florida | 700.00 | |
| Sale of Back Issues | 1.00 | |
| Interest on Bond | 1.25 | |
| Advertising in Journal: | | |
| September, 1949 | 8.00 | |
| December, 1949 | 67.00 | |
| March, 1950 | 222.00 | |
| May, 1950 | 127.00 | 424.00 |
| 1950 Convention Income: | | |
| Convention Fees | 156.50 | |
| S.A.A. Dues | 16.00 | |
| A.E.T.A. Dues | 24.00 | |
| Tournament Income | 342.00 | |
| Exhibits | 50.00 | |
| Transportation | 18.75 | |
| Refund by A.E.T.A. Committee | 18.10 | |
| Sale of Badges | 4.12 | 629.47 |
| | | <u>\$3,390.25</u> |

DISBURSEMENTS:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Printing of Journal, May, 1950 | 650.91 |
| Postage | 56.99 |
| Printing | 101.68 |
| Dues paid to other Organizations | 2.00 |
| 1950 Convention Expenses: | |
| Badges | 48.62 |
| Painting Signs | 10.50 |
| A.S.H.A. Workshop | 22.05 |

Financial Statement

105

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|------------|
| Room Expense | 10.50 | |
| Meeting Rooms | 110.00 | |
| Tournament Expense | 120.09 | |
| Comp. Banquet Tickets | 6.00 | |
| Misc. Cash Expense | 6.65 | |
| Registration Expense | 12.00 | |
| S.A.A. Dues forwarded | 16.00 | |
| A.E.T.A. Dues forwarded | 24.00 | |
| Programs | 90.00 | |
| Mimeographing | 15.75 | |
| Transportation | 32.66 | |
| Flowers | 10.20 | |
| President's Expense | 31.11 | 566.13 |
| | | <hr/> |
| Total Disbursements | | 1,377.71 |
| Balance in Bank | | 1,955.54 |
| Cash On Hand | | 57.00 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | | \$3,390.25 |
| | | <hr/> |

I certify that this statement is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

T. Earle Johnson
Executive Secretary

ATTENTION FORENSICS COACHES

At the annual meeting of the Association last Spring in Birmingham, plans were approved in the general business meeting for the making of our annual Tournament and Congress an experimental proving-ground for the improvement of forensics activities in the South. There seemed to be a general agreement that ours was the tournament of the year where improved plans for contest work could most logically be introduced.

Accordingly, a committee of three — Dallas C. Dickey, Paul Brandes, and myself, as Tournament Director — was set up by the President of the association to study the entire forensics situation and to suggest improvements. This committee has been functioning since its appointment and we believe that we will have something to offer to the Association that will be a step forward in our work. Many suggestions have already come to the committee — suggestions varying in degree from those advocating that we dispense entirely with judges, that we do away with ranking speakers, first, second, and third, on down to suggestions of a minor nature — and we are now considering each with its merits and demerits. If you have a suggestion for the Tournament or Congress, now is the time to speak. We welcome your suggestions.

As last year, we will select a second question for debate in the latter part of the year. The procedure will be to select a representative committee of debate coaches to suggest appropriate propositions, then our standing Tournament committee will reword the propositions, and finally they will be submitted to the coaches of the Association for a vote.

Plan to attend the Tournament and Congress in Gainesville, Florida, April 3-7, 1951, which will be held in the new buildings on the campus of the University of Florida. We believe that we can guarantee an enjoyable trip to Florida and an improved Tournament and Congress.

Batsell Barrett Baxter,
Tournament Director,
David Lipscomb College

MID-CENTURY SPEECH CONFERENCE

The Mid-Century Speech Conference of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA which is to be held this year at the Hotels Commodore and Roosevelt in New York City on December 27, 28, 29 and 30 promises to be the largest and most interesting in the Association's history. SAA is meeting jointly with the American Educational Theatre Association, the Committee on Debate Materials of the National University Extension Association, and the National Thespian Society. Joint programs have been planned with the National Society for the Study of Communication, the National Discussion Foundation, the American Forensic Association, the New York Society for General Semantics, and the American Dialect Society.

Eight general sessions and more than a hundred sectional meetings covering all of the areas of the field of speech will feature addresses, demonstrations and discussions by specialists from educational institutions from every part of the country. Representatives of the American government, the United Nations, and many national and international organizations will take part.

The main speaker at the Association's Luncheon at which SAA will honor its founders and early officers will be Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, a former professor of speech. Such prominent educational leaders as Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, and Willard E. Givens, Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, will make important contributions to the convention program.

Other speakers prominent in professions closely related to the field of speech will include such figures as Foy D. Kohler, Director of the *Voice of America*; William Agar, Department of Public Information of the United Nations; Victor Reuther, United Automobile Workers; Chester I. Barnard, the Rockefeller Foundation; Mrs. Lois S. Johnson, Editor of the American Junior Red Cross *News and Journal*; Clyde Kluckhohn, Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University; Albert Crews, the Protestant Radio Commission; Dr. R. J. McCracken, Riverside Church, New York City; Thomas C. Pollock, Dean of Washington Square College, New York University; and such famous figures in the fields of radio, television and theatre as Lowell Thomas, Charles A. Siepmann, Paul Lazarsfeld, Worthing-

ton Minor, Barrett H. Clark, and Robert Edmund Jones.

Papers and discussions covering a wide range of topics will be featured at a number of sectional meetings on the Linguistic and Scientific Aspects of Speech; Speech and Hearing; Pathology and Therapy; Oral Reading and Interpretation; Radio and Television; Theatre; Speech Education; and Rhetoric and Public Address.

Many special events have been planned for the entertainment of the membership during their stay in New York City, including conducted tours of the United Nations and Downtown Manhattan. The Languild Convention Service will cooperate with our convention committees in obtaining tickets for theatres, concerts, television and radio broadcasts, and information about restaurants, night clubs, shopping, exhibits, museums, transportation, and sightseeing *free of charge* to our members.

Although the members of SAA and AETA will have received the summer brochure announcing the convention, your cooperation in urging the members to call to the attention of their colleagues and friends the features of the Mid-Century Speech Conference will be deeply appreciated by the convention committees.

JOHN B. NEWMAN
Queens College
Public Relations Committee, SAA

BOOK REVIEWS

THE ART OF SCENIC DESIGN. By Lee Simonson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950; pp. 174; \$4.50.

In one of the most satisfying typographically arranged theatre volumes of the year, Lee Simonson has described and illustrated certain basic concepts of the staging and designing of theatre buildings and theatrical productions from the days of Vitruvius to the present. In some 53 pages of text material and 124 pages of carefully selected and excellently reproduced plates, Simonson describes the contributions which the architects made to the theatre followed by the period of the painter when the proscenium arch was indeed a frame for the theatre artist in which to exhibit his masterpieces of painted perspectives. The development of perspective became an "open sesame" to the stage artist and the period of stage painting is described as one in which the designer "had to make a small, level closely bounded space seem greater than it actually was, to achieve the illusion of depth, distance, and a heightened resemblance to reality." Then, at the turn of the present century, the artist was replaced by theatre designers such as Gordon Craig and the German and Russian impressionists who saw the stage as space and became "architects of stage space" with "the control of lighting serving as a second brush." Simonson points out that every form of design in the last fifty years has introduced some elements of Impressionism and he adds that unit settings and some form of screen settings have been the basis for the most important achievements of both designers and directors in recent years.

The interdependence of the designer, the director, the actor, and the playwright in the development of theatrical art is constantly emphasized by the author. For example, the emphasis on reality in playwriting and acting obviously influenced the theatrical designer who had depended greatly on painted perspective to gain his effect even to the point where he was painting figures of a crowd scene on the back drop so as to blend in with the live actors on the stage.

Simonson's literary style is already familiar to those who have read *The Stage is Set or Part of a Lifetime*. The epigrammatic method has not changed and hence the reader does not forget such succinct statements as "any production is an experiment and any performance is an event," or "the director of a play dominates it as Toscanini or Stokowski does a symphony he is interpreting." Another characteristic of Simonson's style is that of describing an entire century through a few well chosen names and sentences. The theatre of the nineteenth century, for example, is presented by the contributions of the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, William Schlegel, Will Macready, Antoine of the Theatre Libre, Stanislavsky, and Strindberg. On such convenient and well recognized pegs, Simonson weaves a complete century of theatre tapestry.

While the text material is not new, Simonson's analysis and synthesis of theatre history places new emphasis on familiar facts. In one instance, however, he has been of invaluable service in presenting his translation of Adolphe Appia's description of the staging and especially the lighting of Wagner's

Tristan and Isolde (1899). Simonson notes that Appia's scenario is based on the assumption that "there must be an integration of form, movement and light into an aesthetic unity" although later he points out that "theatrical production and scenic design are not governed by aesthetic absolutes." The collaboration of the designer and director is evident in Appia's maxim that "the audience must see the word of the protagonists as they themselves see it." Also, Simonson reminds us that the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen was the first man to include the figures of actors as an integral part of the preliminary stage designs.

Simonson's basic theme is that in spite of the centuries intervening between the Renaissance and the present, stage design has not changed and that many practices of today may be traced back to the Renaissance. The development of the fore-stage and its disappearance during the 18th and 19th centuries, only to re-emerge in the arena stage of today, is a case in point since basically it involves the theatrical principle of establishing a vital contact between the actor and the audience.

Turning from history to practice, Simonson's undisputed position as one of the outstanding technicians and designers in the American theatre today lends special emphasis to his many practical suggestions to designers. He discourages the use of projected scenery as being too expensive for the effect gained. He recommends the use of cotton velour for sky cycloramas because it does not show wrinkles. He offers the suggestion that steel blue gelatine be used along with ambers in daylight lighting so as to restore colors of costumes and makeup which may be washed out. These suggestions and his all-too brief description of his staging of *Liliom* and *Goat Song* are valuable to all theatre workers.

The book is described as "a pictorial analysis of stage setting" and the plates comprising more than half the volume are divided into three sections: (1) portraits of productions and theatres from 1545 to 1949, in which the emphasis is placed on the similarity of today and yesterday; (2) pictures and work-drawings of twenty productions by Simonson, including his detailed work-drawings for *Faust*, *Marco Millions* and others, as well as several designs for Wagnerian productions at the Metropolitan Opera House; and (3) pictures of six productions of *Hamlet*, including Robert Edmond Jones' unit set (1923), Vlatislav Hoffman's use of screens (1926), Norman Bel Geddes' production (1931) which includes an interesting "action chart" of a portion of the first act, Stewart Chaney's use of four levels plus a fore stage and central area (1936), and Donald Oenslager's designs.

Lee Simonson's eminent position in the American theatre makes anything he writes worth while reading for students of the theatre. In addition, the many plates reproduced sufficiently large enough to study without the use of a magnifying glass, the translation of the Appia scenario, and Simonson's pervasive enthusiasm for the theatre and all that is theatrical combine to make this volume one of the most important theatre publications in recent years.

DELWIN B. DUSENBURY

University of Florida

A TREASURY OF THE THEATRE: From Henrik Ibsen to Arthur Miller. Edited by John Gassner. New York: Simon and Schuster (distributed by The Dryden Press), 1950; pp. viii + 1120; \$5.50.

Pragmatically, the most obvious evaluation to which one subjects such a college text anthology of modern plays as this may be stated negatively as follows: how little supplementation with library copies of additional plays for an entire class to read will be needed? For the teacher of modern drama the answer in reference to Gassner's newest edition is gratifying: little, indeed. For here are included almost all the staple entrées in the modern dramatic diet, together with a wide range of choices in hors d'oeuvre, salad and dessert; Schnitzler with the liqueur unfortunately is omitted. Or, to change the metaphor in midstream, the anthologist rides no hobby-horse to death; few readers will question his catholicity of taste. Shaw's *Saint Joan*, not commercially available for anthologizing, a Sherwood, a Rice, an American folk play for most teachers, these are the only plays which will need to be assigned elsewhere than within the covers of this book. Among the fortunate omissions is the pinerotic, English, well-bred problem play. At last we are shut of these!

A revision of the 1940 "Ibsen to Odets" volume taken from the earlier *A Treasury of the Theatre* first co-edited with Burns Mantle, this present anthology contains one abridged text of a long play, thirty-four long plays in their entirety, and four one-act plays, making thirty-nine selections in all. Readers of avant-garde plays from the recent past will be amused to learn that Brecht, Lorca, and Sartre have finally been bestowed the accolade of academic respectability: that distinction (sometimes extinction?) of having plays included in a college text. Brecht and the Epic Theatre movement is represented by selected scenes from *The Private Life of the Master Race*, a panoramic, yet quietly compassionate observation of Nazidom's treatment of its workaday citizens. Lorca's powerful verse tragedy, *Blood Wedding*, and Sartre's study of guilt, *The Flies*, are also notable additions to this collection. All of these should be taught, and the latter two ought to be produced by college theatres seeking interesting, beautiful plays. Other plays new to the collection include *Blithe Spirit*, *Our Town*, *The Little Foxes*, *My Heart's in the Highlands*, *The Glass Menagerie* and *Death of a Salesman*, representing British and American contributions to recent playwriting, and works by Becque, Wedekind, Tolstoy, Maeterlinck, Karel Capek, Barrie, O'Casey, and Maugham of the less contemporary modern period.

Forty-four double-columned pages of historical-critical editorial comment in four sections entitled "Realism and Naturalism," "Departures from Realism," "Modern Drama in England and Ireland," and "Modern American Drama" dictate the manner in which the book is organized, revealing a perspicacious sense of interplay between theatre, drama, and life. The editor holds, and rightly, that few national boundaries exist in the world of modern drama. As always with Mr. Gassner, the both urbane and metropolitan world view of one chiefly interested in social criticism prevails. And this is almost always the strength and occasionally the weakness of the play selection and editorial work. In treating American drama, for instance, the folk play or the play dealing

with a specific region of "the American hinterland," Mr. Gassner gives short shrift. All of the American plays included or discussed are products of the Broadway stage.

Although succinct, the editorial comments may easily be followed by the undergraduate reader. Especially cogent is such a statement as the following, contrasting the logical construction of the well-made play with that of modern drama:

The Ibsen-Shaw school added a logic of social reality. It implicated the *world of the characters and not merely the world of the play*—that is, it considered the milieu from which human beings acquire their manners and beliefs, their problems, their social status and livelihood, and their ideas. The modern use of logic involved, in addition, the free play of critical reason on habitual life and thought, the pleasure of keen argument, the delight in the exchange or conflict of opinions. Logic, in short, was a drab servant in the older theatre. It was a bright mistress or clever wife in the new theatre.

Gassner sees Shavian comedy as a "new" category: "There have been only four types of comedy in the world: Aristophanic comedy, comedy of manners, romantic comedy, and comedy of ideas. All but the last were creations of past ages."

Least successful of these introductions is the one on "Departures from Realism." To present in capsule form the bases for differentiating between yesterday's various antinaturalists is difficult, to say the least. Expressionism and symbolism will still need to be given a complete treatment by the teacher aware of interrelations between staging and dramaturgy.

Gassner also includes introductions to the individual playwrights. Those to Strindberg, O'Neill, and Chekhov are particularly successful. For its excellent collection of plays with many new, interesting additions, its easy-to-look-at format, its brilliant, lucid editorial comment by a man who has worked in the theatre and knows its plays, this new *Treasury of the Theatre* may indeed be dubbed "Treasury." It can be recommended without hesitation as a superior text edition for college classes.

ROBERT J. DIERLAM.

University of Florida.

THE STAGE AND THE SCHOOL. By Katharine Anne Ommanney and Pierce C. Ommanney. Second Revised Edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950; pp. xvi + 571; \$2.40.

The second revised edition of this well-known textbook has been enlarged with a more detailed study of the techniques, history and production of motion pictures, radio and television. According to the authors, "In this edition every

effort has been made to bring the subject matter up to date without the loss of the fundamental values which have led to its extensive use."

A senior high school dramatics teacher will here find a textbook which has excellent illustrations, exercises, and a series of appendices almost doubling the book's value. These include a list of classified plays for high school production, intelligent bibliographies, interesting dramatic recordings, a listing of one hundred outstanding films, suggestions which will help to simplify the problems of a dramatics teacher, a plan for organizing a dramatic club, and advice to young persons who are considering a career on stage, screen, radio or television.

Although the book is interestingly written, its comprehensibility for the average high school pupil might be questioned. The text contains many good projects, discussion questions, and assignments, arranged so that they come at the end of a unit of work rather than at the end of a chapter or a division in the book.

The authors suggest the following as material for a one-semester course: Part One, Two, and Three, with reference work from the rest of the book. It is the reviewer's belief that for a one-semester course the suggested revision of material which follows would enhance the student's interest and give the instructor more inspired and enthusiastic groups: Part Four, Chapters 13, 16, 14, and 15; Part Three, Chapters 8, 7, 9, and 10; and Part Two, Chapters 5 and 6 in the order listed. The reviewer feels that the instructor will present a more highly successful course — whether it is one semester, one year, or two years if a careful selection of parts and chapters are made and the order of parts and chapters not followed as they have been written.

The subject-matter is excellent. The book deserves to be rated as a superior text for a course in high school dramatics.

FRANCES COX.

Newport News High School
Newport News, Virginia.

DISCUSSION IN HUMAN AFFAIRS. By James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950; pp. viii + 432; \$3.00.

The critic of revised editions is often faced with an ambiguous assignment: if the revision represents only a superficial change, he may choose to re-appraise the worth of the original subject matter; if the new edition re-works and re-orders the old material, he may decide to criticize the value of the modifications; if the revision adds original subject matter to the previous addition, he may restrict himself to a review of the additions. *Discussion In Human Affairs*, the first revision of *The Principles And Methods Of Discussion*, contains sufficient original, re-worked, and new material, to justify doing all of these things.

The authors of this edition, as in their earlier work, have endeavored to supply college and adult readers with a discussion text whose purpose is "(1) to

explain discussion as a means of better understanding of human affairs . . . and (2) to develop attitudes and skills which enable people to participate in discussion competently." That this emphasis on understanding and skill has been more effectively achieved in the current edition than in the original is beyond doubt. Even the changed organization of subject matter serves to emphasize this dual purpose. Where the original text was largely topical in organization, the present work is divided into four parts, each emphasizing a different aspect of group communications. "Part I, An Introduction to Discussion," is predominantly philosophical in purpose. Discussion is defined, described, and clearly differentiated from other means of social inquiry and action. "Part II, The Logical Bases of Discussion," includes all material dealing with the rational nature of group discussion. The pattern of reflective thinking, the types of reasoning, the applications of evidence, and obstacles to thought, are handled in this section of the book. "Part III, The Management of Discussion," deals with the practical problems of discussion. Instructions are given on phrasing the problem, on preparing for and participating in discussion, and on leading groups which are attempting to solve problems cooperatively. In "Part IV, Types of Discussion," the various forms — the panel, dialogue, symposium, forum — are explained, and their application in specific situations is treated. The Appendixes include transcripts of actual discussions, rules for the Delta Sigma Rho Congress, and Lyman Bryson's lecture "Discussion in the Democratic Process." While the grouping of chapters brings related subject matter together, it may make the text more difficult to use in teaching. It is unlikely that most teachers of discussion can afford to complete the first half of the book before having their classes engage in actual discussions, the directions for which are not introduced until the latter half of the text. Some minor criticism can be made also of the sequence of chapters in Part I, where specific information on discussion is given before the more general rationale has been provided, and in Part II, where the material of reasoning precedes the instruction on the uses and tests of evidence.

Teachers who are acquainted with the original edition will want to know what material has been retained from the original, in what ways the earlier treatment has been altered, and the extent and worth of added subject matter. Those chapters which, in the first edition, dealt with the purposes of discussion, the steps in reflective thinking, and the applications of discussion, are retained, as are the chapters on discussion problems, preparation, and participation. It would be difficult to discover weaknesses or inaccuracies which would warrant revising the original treatment of these topics. Chapters which have undergone substantial alteration deal with the means and ends of discussion, the uses of evidence, reasoning, and obstacles to reflective thinking. In several of these, the revision has improved the treatment considerably. The chapters on evidence and obstacles to reflective thinking, for example, have been simplified so that their teachability has been increased without noticeable sacrifice in accuracy. The reflective process is explained in greater detail and with more profuse illustration. In the seven chapters of original material there is so much of value that it is possible to highlight only the major contributions. Chapter III, "Discussion as a Means of Social Action," furnishes the reader with both

a graphic and verbal schematic of the relations between communications, philosophy, politics, and logic. (It is the clearest statement of this relationship known to the reviewer in current discussion literature.) Another chapter has been added dealing with the specific adaptations of the reflective pattern to problems of fact, value, and policy. The highest praise is reserved, however, for two chapters entitled, "Techniques of Participation" and "Techniques of Leadership." In the former, the authors explain how "emphasis," "division," "limited disagreement," "retraction and correction," etc., can be used to enhance the contributions of participants. In the latter chapter, the authors forsake the traditional and barren citation of desirable personal qualities in leaders for a functional exposition of what the leader must *do* in order to effectively guide his group. Specific directions are given on how to start a discussion, how to get crucial issues considered, and how to conclude the discussion. In short, the revised edition has enlarged the scope of the book, improved the presentation of former subject matter, and added original materials which should contribute greatly to the book's usefulness.

For the instructor of group discussion, however, who is interested in a text which will give adequate emphasis to the *psychological* as well as rational and philosophical bases of discussion, this book will prove another disappointment. The new title, *Discussion In Human Affairs*, suggests a treatment which would stress the psychological principles governing group behavior. True, some chapters touch this subject indirectly, but nowhere has an adequate treatment been given to interpersonal relations in group activity. This deficiency is equally noticeable in our other texts in discussion, but it is, nonetheless, a criticism of contemporary writing in this area.

The format of the revised edition has been improved by a changed cover design, the use of greater contrast in print which has made chapter outlines unnecessary, and the substitution of a final bibliography for the chapter bibliographies of the first edition.

When a revision of a widely used text appears, the question is inevitably raised, "Is it better than the original?" In this case the answer would be an unequivocal "Yes." As a text for courses in group discussion it is without equal in the extensiveness of its coverage, the thoroughness of its treatment, the originality of its contributions, and the accuracy of its writing.

DEAN C. BARNLUND.

University of Florida.

A MANUAL OF PRONUNCIATION. By Morris H. Needleman. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1949. Pp. cxxiii + 323; \$4.00.

The author, whose previous writing seems to have been in the fields of composition and literature, has compiled a valuable reference book in this *Manual*. The book is divided into two parts, the first being a *Guide to Pronunciation*, and the second a list of approximately 5,800 words in common usage but often mispronounced.

The distinctive feature of the *Manual* is that the pronunciation of each word is indicated in parallel columns by three different methods: (1) simplified respelling, (2) diacritical markings, and (3) phonetic transcription. The author thus hopes to make the book useful to the widest possible group of readers. The rather limited number of words included tend to limit its value and restrict its usefulness, but the words are carefully chosen and the author claims that 99% of them are on the Thorndike List.

The first fourth of the book contains a detailed explanation of the pronunciation systems which he uses. The author has drawn freely from Webster's *Guide to Punctuation* for the explanation of the system of diacritical markings and from standard texts and reference books in speech and linguistics and has combined them into a reference guide which many scholars would find most useful. Unfortunately, it is printed in 8 point type, thus appearing to be subordinate to the list of words, and hence less likely to be used by the average student. Mr. Needleman does not claim to make an original contribution here, but it is evident that he has done a splendid job of compilation and organization of various guides to pronunciation. His explanation of the various sounds in English is complete and thorough with an amazingly small number of errors.

On 319 numbered pages the author lists approximately 5,800 words with various possible pronunciations indicated by the three methods explained above. Denying any attempt to dictate or legislate any pronunciation, the author does claim "that this handbook lists *more* acceptable pronunciations than any other dictionary."

In this reviewer's opinion, the author has included pronunciations which are unacceptable at the present time. Such pronunciations may be fairly common in colloquial usage, but it is doubtful that educated users would approve.

Many of us would question a usage in which the word *adult* was accented on the first syllable, the word *bomb* was pronounced *bum*, *just* could also be pronounced *jest*, and the word *encore* could be accented on either syllable. I believe the vast majority of authorities in the field would rhyme the word *Drama* with *Brahma* and not *grammer*. Yet this *Manual* gives both pronunciations. The *eu*, *ew*, *ue* words may be pronounced either as a pure vowel or a diphthong. Words for which both pronunciations are given include *dew*, *due*, *duel*, *dues*, *duet*, *duke*, *jewel*, *new*, *news* and *Teuton*.

Many examples could be cited which seemingly indicate that the author has listed an unnecessary number of pronunciation variants including some sub-standard ones. For example, six pronunciations are listed for the word *minority*, four for the word *omega* (2 accenting the first syllable), four for *desperado*, four for *fatuity*, and nine for *frontier*. Finally, this reviewer would take strong exception to one of the pronunciations, the first one listed, given for *Louisiana*, the inclusion of the *l* sound in *almond* and several of the nine pronunciations listed for *amateur*. Nor can we accept the broad *a* given for one of the pronunciations of *Alabama*.

Many students will find many parts of this book very useful, but will regret that the author did not discriminate more carefully among the variant pronunciations listed for many words.

T. EARL JOHNSON.

University of Alabama.



